

SECOND
R E P O R T
FROM THE
SELECT COMMITTEE
ON
Emigration from the United Kingdom :
1827.

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
5 April 1827.*

REPORT - - - - - p. 3

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE - - - - - p. 9

R E P O R T.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to consider the Subject of Emigration from the United Kingdom, and to whom the Report of the last Session, and the several Petitions which have been presented to the House, in the present Session of Parliament, on the same subject, were referred; and who were empowered to report their Observations and Opinion thereupon, together with the Minutes of Evidence taken before them from time to time, to the House:—
HAVE further considered the Matters to them referred; and have agreed upon the following REPORT:

THE Inquiry into the general subject of Emigration is connected with so many important Questions, and involves considerations so various and complicated, that although upon many of them Your Committee have received a mass of very valuable and satisfactory Evidence, they do not feel themselves in a situation to present to the House, so soon as they would have desired to do, a general and final Report. But in the prosecution of their investigations, a special Case has been submitted to them, so serious and so urgent, as to induce them to devote to it, for the present, their principal attention, and without further delay to lay it specially before the House.

In addition to those ordinary causes, which in many parts of the United Kingdom appear to have led to a superabundant Population, or rather to a disproportion between the demand and the supply of labour, an important change has been wrought, and is still in gradual but certain progress, in the condition of some of the manufacturing districts, by the transition from Hand-loom to Power-loom weaving. For some time the advance in the cotton trade was so rapid as nearly, if not altogether to absorb in the more productive system, the hands thus thrown out of employment. But difficulties arising from a temporary check in trade, shortly fell upon the weavers with the double pressure of these two combined causes, a diminished demand for the produce of their industry, and an increased facility of production.

Your Committee are fully sensible that, to a certain extent, these disastrous consequences to a portion of the community must follow upon every new invention by which human labour is abridged: and that it is more especially the interest of a commercial country, far from discouraging, to afford every protection to such inventions: and while Your Committee lay down this doctrine in its fullest extent, they feel themselves bound to add, that those who in the present instance are the chief sufferers, appear to manifest juster ideas, and a more ready acquiescence in this general principle, than could have been expected from their situation in life, and from the personal feelings with which their view of the case must be mixed up. But Your Committee would wish to call the attention of the House to two circumstances which appear to distinguish this special case from those of

ordinary occurrence. Independently of the extent of the change, the time at which it has taken place, with reference to their peculiar branch of trade, is for the Weavers most unfortunate;—and most, if not all, the ordinary channels of labour are in such a state of repletion, that it is difficult for them to transfer their industry elsewhere.

Though the state of distress bordering upon actual famine, which these causes have produced in districts extensively concerned in the cotton trade, is so notorious as hardly to require pressing upon the House, Your Committee have had it confirmed by the strongest and fullest evidence. These districts appear to embrace in England a large portion of the county of Lancaster, together with parts of Cheshire, of the West Riding of Yorkshire, and of Cumberland; and in Scotland principally, so far as the evidence before Your Committee has gone, the counties of Renfrew and Lanark. In mitigation of this extensive distress, sums to a very large amount have been raised from various funds, by legal provision, by spontaneous contribution, and recently by the King's letter, and have mainly tended to preserve those districts from the immediate horrors of famine, and from the possible evils of riot and disturbance. But Your Committee deem it their duty, not to conceal from the House, that, notwithstanding the temporary aid thus afforded, the long continued pressure of the lowest class upon the poor rates legally raised in England, and of the same class of persons on the funds raised in various ways in Scotland, has extended the distress to the ranks immediately above; and that not only the local funds appear in many instances nearly exhausted, but the lower order of rate payers, far from being able to contribute to the relief of their pauper neighbours, are become themselves dependent upon casual or parochial assistance.

Under these circumstances, the Manufacturers' Relief Committee, with the fullest daily information before them, concurring in the statement above made, agreeing with Your Committee in opinion, that there is little hope that any revival of trade can bring back the employment of the distressed Hand-loom Weavers, and that the fulness of other branches of labour renders it difficult for them to transfer their industry;—aware also, that temporary aid, however valuable in itself, and however judiciously applied, can only produce temporary benefit, have been led to turn their attention to the objects which Your Committee have in view. Satisfied of the efficiency and permanence of the benefit to be afforded by Emigration, they have signified their readiness to contribute in furtherance of these objects the sum of £.25,000, being a large proportion of their remaining funds, provided the farther sum of £.50,000 can be obtained from other sources.

The assistance thus tendered appears to Your Committee doubly valuable; first, as marking the strong sense entertained by a most respectable and well-informed body, that the mode suggested is at once the cheapest and most effectual relief which can be afforded; and secondly, as furnishing the means of complying with that which Your Committee have uniformly laid down as a rule of action, and have thought it expedient to make the substance of a special Report presented in the present year:—"That private or local contribution in some shape ought to form the basis of any system of Emigration to which it may be expedient for this Committee to recommend any assistance from the National Funds."

Your Committee do not consider it necessary, upon the occasion of this Special Report, to enter into details of expense, they deem it sufficient to
state

state broadly, that they are satisfied from the inquiries which they have made, the particulars of which will, with the Evidence they have hitherto received, shortly be laid before the House; that the sum of £.75,000. if raised, will be sufficient to remove, provision and locate in the North American colonies, above 1,200 families, amounting to between six and seven thousand souls; and Your Committee have received assurances from the Colonial Department, that preparation is already made for receiving, if need were, especially in Nova Scotia, a considerably larger number of Emigrants at a very short notice.

Recurring to the persons whom it is proposed to make the immediate objects of this offer of removal, it is necessary to acquaint the House, that in the districts above alluded to, and more especially in Lancashire, there appear to be among the Hand-loom weavers, two classes almost wholly distinct from each other: the one, who though they take in work in their own houses or cellars, are congregated in the large manufacturing towns; and the other, scattered in small hamlets or single houses, in various directions throughout the manufacturing country. It is to the situation of this latter class, though both are in a state extremely deplorable, that Your Committee would chiefly wish to direct the attention of the House. It appears that persons of this description, for many years past, have been occupiers of small farms of a few acres, which they have held at high rents; and combining the business of a Hand-loom weaver with that of a working farmer, have assisted to raise the rent of their land from the profits of their loom. Upon this class it is, that the distresses of the times have fallen with peculiar hardship. While the decline of their manufacturing business has utterly disabled them from supplying those rents which were due from them as agriculturists, they have found themselves called upon to give support, as liable to the rates, to those of their fellow weavers who were engaged in manufacture alone: and a remnant of honest pride and shame has prevented many of those in the extremest distress from applying for parish relief: while others, being from their remote situation less immediately under the eyes of the regular authorities, have lingered on, till found accidentally, as has been proved in evidence, in the last stages of misery and disease. Your Committee cannot but observe, that while the greater destitution of this latter class points them out as requiring more immediate attention, their partly agricultural habits render them more eligible for the particular kind of relief contemplated by Your Committee: and Your Committee cannot but express a hope that the Hand-loom weavers in general, and this class in particular, will receive from Parliament that attention and favour to which their sufferings and their patience amply entitle them.

Your Committee are strongly impressed with the conviction, that the removal to the colonies of 1,200 families, small as the number may appear when the extent of the district is considered over which it is proposed to spread the relief, will tend in a far greater degree than is commonly supposed, to the diminution of general distress; and while those removed will be placed in a situation of comfort and of ultimate independence, those who remain will be materially benefited by the abstraction of their redundant labour. And it is an object not to be lost sight of, that these settlers may by their success excite a strong feeling in favour of Emigration as a general measure, should it ultimately be carried into effect; and may mainly contribute hereafter to people our colonies by a voluntary, unexpensive and beneficial abstraction from the population of the mother country.

Under these impressions Your Committee, while they profess themselves not yet prepared to lay before the House, the details of a permanent and continuous system of Emigration (which nevertheless they are persuaded may be so organized as to produce very beneficial results) confidently appeal to the House, under the present urgent circumstances; and strongly recommend the grant of £.50,000 from the national funds, in furtherance of an immediate Emigration from the manufacturing districts, at once as a relief from present distress, and as an important national experiment for the future.

In applying for this Grant of public money, Your Committee would have it distinctly understood, that they place the grounds of their recommendation upon the urgency and peculiarity of the case; which appears to them to require prompt and immediate action, even although the means of carrying it into execution may not be so maturely or perfectly concerted, as they might have been, under circumstances of less immediate and alarming pressure.

Your Committee have therefore not paused to consider what portion of the expenditure may ultimately be repaid by the industry and improvements of the settlers in their new situations; although they have little doubt but that the improvement of the lands will be a sufficient guarantee for a certain proportion even of pecuniary return, especially if allowed to be paid in the colony, and in produce for the benefit of future emigrants.

But Your Committee are yet further induced to solicit the immediate attention of the House to the subject of their present Report, because they cannot but be aware, that the very circumstance of their appointment has excited great and earnest expectation; that exaggerated and erroneous accounts of their proceedings are daily circulated, and that hundreds of families, prepared to emigrate, are looking with anxiety to their Report, and the decision of Parliament.

Your Committee by no means express their opinion that upon future occasions, and when the subject shall be better understood, funds may not be raised from parish rates, for the purpose of relieving themselves from the burthen of their redundant populations: on the contrary they have had frequent applications to this specific effect. But they deem it necessary in candour to state, that so far as their inquiries have gone, the funds of the districts to which their present Report alludes, are so far exhausted that no such assistance upon their part can fairly be calculated upon. It is hardly necessary to state, that in this as in every other scheme for Emigration which has ever engaged the attention of Your Committee, it never has been for a moment imagined that it should be other than wholly voluntary: and Your Committee are satisfied, that in the execution of their projects the main difficulty would be to select the objects most eligible among the candidates who would offer themselves for the liberality of Parliament and the Country.

In conclusion, while Your Committee recommend the present Grant wholly in consideration of the present urgency and peculiarity of the distress, which demand that relief, to be effectual should be also immediate, they cannot but express their hope that an experiment now, of the success of which they entertain no doubt, may lead to a more extended, more organized, and more effective system for the future: and in such a system Your Committee confidently anticipate not only a material and perpetual relief to the British Islands,

Islands, but an augmentation to the resources of the Colonies, and an additional link to those connections of blood and interest which now unite them to the Mother Country.

Your Committee cannot however conclude this Report, without expressing their deep conviction, that whatever may be the immediate and urgent demands from other quarters, it is vain to hope for any permanent and extensive advantage from any system of Emigration which does not primarily apply to *Ireland*; whose Population, unless some other outlet be opened to them, must shortly fill up every vacuum created in England or in Scotland, and reduce the labouring classes to a uniform state of degradation and misery. And Your Committee therefore pledge themselves to devote their most anxious attention to the state of that country, and the practicability of applying Emigration as a means of relieving it from its present overwhelming Population.

5th April 1827.

WITNESSES.

Martis, 20^a die Februarii, 1827:
Joseph Foster and James Little - p. 9

Jovis, 22^a die Februarii:
Archibald Campbell, Esq. - p. 18, 148
Thomas Francis Kennedy, Esq. - p. 23
Henry Home Drummond, Esq. - p. 26

Sabbati, 24^a die Februarii:
Major Thomas Moody - p. 29, 47

Martis, 27^a die Februarii:
Rev. John Matthias Turner - p. 37

Jovis, 1^a die Martii:
John Maxwell, Esq. - p. 50
Mr. William Spencer }
Northhouse - - - } - p. 51, 118
John Tait and James Wilson - p. 68

Sabbati, 3^a die Martii:
Alexander Carlisle Buchanan, }
Esq. - - - - - } p. 70, 167

Martis, 6^a die Martii:
William Bowman Pekon, }
Esq. - - - - - } p. 77, 131

Jovis, 8^a die Martii:
Capt. James Dent Wensley - p. 88
John O'Donoghue, Esq. - p. 90

Sabbati, 10^a die Martii:
John Smith, Esq. - p. 93

Martis, 13^a die Martii:
Dr. John Strachan - p. 94

Jovis, 15^a die Martii:
Walter Burrell, Esq. - p. 100
Mr. Thomas Bradbury - p. 106

Sabbati, 17^a die Martii:
David Polley Francis, Esq. - p. 108, 135
Thomas Pringle, Esq. - p. 114
Frederick Carlisle, Esq. - p. 119
Lieut. Thomas Charles White, p. 121, 168
Henry Ellis, Esq. - p. 123
Mr. John Finlaison - p. 133

Martis, 20^a die Martii:
Thomas Looose, Esq. - p. 137
Mr. James Taylor - p. 140
Mr. James Homewood - p. 144
Mr. Samuel Maine - p. 146

Sabbati, 24^a die Martii:
Return, addressed to the Overseers of Townships, Parish of Whitlow, County of Chester, by J. M. Turner, Recor- }
ter, - - - - - } p. 148
Alexander Campbell, Esq. - ibid.

Martis, 27^a die Martii:
Statement delivered in by Sir }
Henry Parnell, on the Po- }
pulation of Ireland - - - } p. 166
A. C. Buchanan, Esq. delivers }
in Specification of Reasons }
of Provisions to be furnished }
to Emigrants - - - - - } p. 167
Mr. George Thompson - p. 168
Mr. Richard Webber Eaton - p. 171

Jovis, 29^a die Martii:
William Fielden, Esq. - p. 175
William Hulton, Esq. - p. 181

Sabbati, 31^a die Martii:
Mr. William Ludlow Fitzhugh - p. 189
Mr. Thomas Adams - p. 200

Martis, 3^a die Aprilis:
Lord Bishop of Chester - p. 201
William Henry Hyett, Esq. - p. 210
Capt. Henry William Scott, R.N. p. 218

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Mortis, 20^e die Februarij, 1827.

R. J. WILMOT HORTON, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Joseph Foster and James Little, called in; and Examined.

1. (*To Joseph Foster.*)—WHERE do you live?—At Glasgow.
2. You are a member of the Glasgow Emigration Society?—I am president of the Glasgow Emigration Society; Mr. Little and myself were delegated by them to attend this Committee.
3. That is not the only society for the purpose of emigration, at Glasgow?—No, there are more.
4. You are not authorized by any other society to make communications to this Committee?—No; on consulting with some of the presidents and members of some of the other societies, we had the approbation of a few, but we were not authorized by any but our own.

5. Since when is it that you have turned your attention to emigrating to the North American Provinces?—It is nearly two years since a certain proportion, about eleven or twelve families, turned their attention to that, and about one year ago we increased that number. In the month of May last we petitioned the Right honourable the Secretary of State of the Colonial Department, for a grant of land in Canada, and the means of occupying it; we got for answer, that no funds existed in that department; we then appointed delegates to call upon his Grace the Duke of Hamilton and Brandon, being the most influential nobleman in Lanarkshire, to ask his opinion, and obtain his interest if possible.

6. Are the Committee to understand that your motive in making those applications with respect to emigration, arose from the impossibility of finding employment, or rather of receiving wages sufficient to support yourselves and your families?—Undoubtedly.

7. Since what period has that inconvenience attached to you?—The period that the distress became general, and almost intolerable, was about, I think, February last.

8. Have you got any written statements with you, respecting the average rate of wages for the particular employment in which you and the other persons applying for emigration are concerned?—We have not a written statement, but we have made a minute examination, and are prepared to give an average statement on that subject.

9. You yourself are an operative weaver?—Yes.

10. Are the rest of your society in the same employment as yourself?—They are not all, but a great proportion of them are.

11. What employment do the others follow?—A few shoemakers, and one or two labourers, but the great proportion are weavers.

12. You consider the distress of the weavers as totally distinct from that of the spinners?—Yes, we are quite certain it is.

13. Have you any spinners among your society?—I am not quite certain; I think there is one or two.

14. As you state that the distress is chiefly limited to the weavers, how comes it that there should be persons of those other trades in your society?—The distress bears, in my opinion, very heavily upon shoemakers likewise; there are a great

*Joseph Foster
and
James Little.**20 February,
1827.*

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.
20 February,
1827.

number of them out of employment, and their wages are very low. With respect to the spinners, there are peculiar motives, and I cannot precisely say; their wages I know are better; and there is a delicacy in men, who are neighbours one to another, objecting to a person entering into a society, who comes forward and wishes to enter.

15. Will you explain to the Committee the nature of your employment as a weaver?—The machines that we employ are all at the expense of the operative, with the exception of what is called the wheel, which is a trifling part of the materials necessary; the hours of working are various, they are sometimes working eighteen and nineteen hours, and even all night is quite common one or two nights in the week; and on the calculation that we have made of the wages, after deducting the necessary expenses, they will not amount to more than from four shillings and sixpence to seven shillings per week.

16. Is your work by the piece, or by the day?—Uniformly piece-work.

17. Will you describe to the Committee, with respect to yourself, what is your particular engagement, and in what manner it is executed, as between yourself and your master?—The general habit of the work is by the web; if it be fine, it occupies a longer time, it may be a fortnight, three weeks, four weeks, or even six weeks, but that is the nature of the bargain; when the materials are wrought up, and the web is finished, the bargain is done.

18. At the period when the work commences, the wages are fixed?—The wages are fixed at the pleasure of the master or employer for the next web again.

19. Supposing the web takes five or six weeks to execute?—The wages continue the same.

20. No circumstance changes the engagement?—Unless the materials are found deficient; if those are wrong, that is a circumstance that leads to a new bargain; if, on referring to persons qualified to judge, it is found to be so, there is a new bargain; but if the materials are found to be sufficient, no circumstance whatever can vary the bargain.

21. What is the particular sort of article that you manufacture?—There are great variety of articles; it is all cotton.

22. Do you work in a large factory, or do you carry on your work in your own house?—There are few instances of work carried on in Glasgow and its neighbourhood in large factories, it is all carried on in our own houses, or apartments connected with them; there are almost no large factories.

23. Therefore speaking of the operatives that you come here to represent, the nature of their engagement is, that they contract for webs of cotton to be manufactured in their own houses by the piece?—Yes, by the yard, which amounts to the same.

24. You have stated that your present rate of engagement gives you wages equal to between 4s. and 7s. per week, according to the time that you work?—It is not according to the time we work, it is according to the quality of the work, as there is very fine and very coarse, and more wages may be made at one than at another; a man that works eighteen or nineteen hours, works at 4s. at one kind of work, when he might probably earn 6s. at another.

25. That arises from the one being a better class of work than the other?—Yes.

26. When you originally became a weaver, were not the wages of labour sufficient to remunerate you?—Yes.

27. At what period was that?—About the year 1800, and down to 1803 or 1805.

28. Can you state what wages you received at that time for the two sorts of work for which you now describe the average wages per week to be 7s. and 4s.?—I cannot go into particulars, but I am quite certain that the work that we do now for 4s. 6d. and 5s. would have afforded by the same industry 20s. at that period and a number of years later than that.

29. To what causes do you attribute a fall in your wages?—Undoubtedly, competition in trade; the merchants selling them lower, who can bring them lower to market, and then of course reducing the workmen; this was the immediate cause.

30. Has there been any machinery introduced since 1800 in this particular branch of weaving?—A great proportion is now done by machinery.

31. With respect to your own individual work do you execute the work entrusted to you more by machinery now than you did in 1800?—We have better improved materials or implements of working, but I have not wrought in the machine factories; when I speak of weaving, I speak of hand-loom weaving.

32. Is it the fact that the work you now execute by hand is also executed by machinery on a larger scale?—Yes.
33. Is it the fact that that machinery upon a larger scale existed when you first went into this trade?—No.
34. The Committee suppose that in consequence of the distress you have experienced, you and others connected with you have endeavoured to obtain employment in other branches of trade?—Yes.
35. Have you found that there is no demand for your services in other branches of trade?—There is none.
36. You feel therefore in fact that there is hardly any resource left to you, under those circumstances?—We know of none.
37. Have the habits of any of those persons who belong to this society ever been agricultural?—Some of them have been partially agricultural; particularly these twelve months past they have been working at different employments, roads, and such other works as they could get a subsistence by.
38. The distress among the persons whom you represent is extremely severe, is it not?—Extremely severe.
39. You state, in the petition of your society, that many of them have sold their household furniture, in order to pay their rent; does that apply generally to the persons who belong to the society?—It does to the society, and to others likewise; but it does apply to those operatives I have before mentioned.
40. Have your friends from whom you are in the habit of receiving letters from Canada?—I have a brother, who writes to me occasionally.
41. From what part of Canada?—The township of Gravelle.
42. When did he go over there?—Eight years in next May.
43. Under what circumstances did he go over?—He had a few pounds, and paid his own passage, and went there; he had a wife and two children.
44. Do you know enough of his history to be able to inform the Committee how he got settled upon the lands he now occupies?—A number went about that time, and some years after, depending upon the Government grant; he considered that he would go upon his own property, but he wrote to me that that was an error, and that by some influence, which he did not detail, he obtained the grant that Government had given to others, and that had it not been for that, his little property would not have put him into comfortable circumstances.
45. Are you aware whether your brother obtained a free grant, or whether he had to pay a fee upon it?—I am not; but I am aware that he was favoured particularly by Government, or he could not have got into comfortable circumstances.
46. Do you know the number of acres he occupies, or any thing respecting the details of his situation at this moment?—It is a year past since I got a letter; I wrote to him, but I have not received an answer, and I cannot detail his condition.
47. Does he speak of himself as being in a prosperous situation?—He does, and he expressed his astonishment upon every occasion that I did not exert myself in some way or other to come over there.
48. Your society consists of 140 persons?—Yes, one hundred and forty heads of families.
49. Of those persons, how many are there in the prime of life, between the ages of 14 and 50, who are perfectly well in health and proper subjects for emigration?—I think a hundred and twenty or thirty may be in that situation; there are some of them, I know, that are not; but for the same reason that I mentioned before respecting the spinners, we admitted a few of those.
50. What trade was your brother in?—He was a weaver.
51. Had he been employed in agricultural labour before he went?—He was, a little; he was partially acquainted with it.
52. Is not it a fact that a large portion of the hand weavers in Scotland, in harvest and in hay time, work in the field?—Yes, a great proportion of them do.
53. Has that long been their custom?—It has.
54. Have you continued a weaver since the year 1800 up to this time?—Yes.
55. During that time have you found great vicissitudes in your trade?—Yes.
56. Have you been in a good situation at many times during that period?—Yes; we have many times been in a comfortable situation.
57. Is it your opinion, that although you have many times been in an uncomfortable situation, the number of hand-loom weavers during that period has much increased?—Yes, it has increased very much.
58. And at the same time the machine weaving has also increased?—Yes, the machine

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.

25 February,
1827.

machine weaving for about six or eight years back has rapidly increased; it seemed to absorb every thing, except very fine fabrics.

59. As power-loom weaving has increased, has the distress of the hand weavers also increased in the same proportion?—Undoubtedly it has.

60. Have you any hope that any possible improvement in the cotton trade would provide in future for the hand weavers who are now out of employment?—We are quite confident it will not.

61. Have the weavers a general persuasion that the hand weaving is a business which is nearly extinct altogether?—They have; that is the general impression of all the well informed and intelligent weavers.

62. What was the last year in which you, as a hand weaver, were in a good situation?—It is eight or ten years past.

63.—In 1822, were not you in a tolerably good situation?—It was tolerable in 1822.

64. How long did that continue?—I could not answer that exactly.

65. Was it not tolerably good up to 1824?—It was tolerable; but the wages even in 1824 were far below what would be considered sufficient to keep a family comfortable.

66. Did you think of emigrating in 1825?—I did; I thought of emigrating on any occasion when it was in my power, from the time my brother went away.

67. Was there not a general association among the hand-loom weavers in Glasgow during the year 1824, for the purpose of emigrating?—It was not general; the only society that we know of was that that we are connected with; at that time it became general, about the time that the Emigration Committee made their Report.

68. Are there many Irish, in Glasgow and Paisley and that neighbourhood, now employed as hand weavers?—There are a considerable number.

69. Has that supply of weavers from Ireland increased within the last eight years?—I think it has.

70. Has it increased since the steam boats began to pass from Ireland to Glasgow?—I do not think that the weaving department has increased much; there have been a great number of labourers at our public works.

71. Do not great numbers of Irish come over for employment, from Belfast and that neighbourhood, to Glasgow?—Yes, constantly.

72. You have stated that the wages of your labour are insufficient to support you, and that you have turned your attention to other branches of labour; and you have stated that you found none in which there was a demand for your services; do not you attribute that very materially to the number of Irish people that have come over and have been employed as labourers, which has lowered the wages of labour?—We do.

73. You have stated that your distress first commenced about eight years ago; do you know when the power-loom was first brought into operation?—I cannot state exactly, but I know about that time it became general.

74. Are the Committee to understand that you attribute the insufficiency of your remuneration for your labour, to the introduction of machinery?—Yes.

75. Do you consider, therefore, that the introduction of machinery is objectionable?—We do not; the weavers in general, of Glasgow and its vicinity, do not consider that machinery can or ought to be stopped, or put down; they know perfectly well that machinery must go on, that it will go on, and that it is impossible to stop it; they are aware that every implement of agriculture and manufacture is a portion of machinery, and indeed every thing that goes beyond the teeth and nails (if I may use the expression) is a machine. I am authorized by the majority of our society, to say that I speak their minds as well as my own, in stating this.

76. Are you aware of the tax on printed cottons?—I know there is a tax on printed cottons.

77. In hand weaving, you can weave variegated patterns, without printing?—Yes.

78. The power-loom, as yet, cannot do that?—It cannot do that; but in some instances it does perform it tolerably well at present, and it is going on rapidly to perfection, even in that point.

79. Then the tax which is laid upon printed goods is saved upon those articles that are woven by the hand loom?—It is.

80. If the tax on printed goods were repealed, the hand weavers could not come into competition at all with the power-loom?—No. With respect to the tax on cotton

cotton goods being repealed, the consumer and the manufacturer would receive the benefit, and not we.

81. Was there not a machine at Paisley that could weave what is called tambour muslins?—Yes.

82. Is that in operation still?—I believe it is; but I am not certain as to that.

83. Do you consider that a reduction in the present price of corn would operate to give you relief, under the present circumstances of the trade?—That is a question that I am scarcely capable of answering; there is a variety of opinions upon that point; the general impression upon the mind of the weavers is, that it would.

84. In what manner do you yourself suppose it would operate to give you relief, under the circumstances of your trade, there being no demand for your particular labour, so as to pay you a remunerating price; would not the probable consequence of a diminution in the price of corn be, to reduce your wages below what they now are, so as to meet that additional cheapness?—The general opinion of the weavers is, that it would benefit the trade, by enabling the countries from which we received the corn, to take part of our manufactures; but when we recollect that machinery will be just increased in proportion as the demand for manufactures is increased, we are quite certain that hand weaving cannot, under the present circumstances, afford a living, even were that to be obtained.

85. Your opinion is, that a reduction in the price of corn would be generally advantageous to the labouring classes, but that in your particular case it would be of no use to you, because you would come into competition with those that would be equally benefited by it?—Yes.

86. Have the wages for weaving risen and fallen occasionally since you have been in the trade?—They have, but they have generally fallen lower and lower, down to the present time; when they got rather better again, they never rose to what they were before.

87. Did a reduction in the price of wages take place upon the fall of the price of corn?—I cannot say that it had directly that effect at that time.

88. What has been the cause of your reduction of wages?—I have answered that; in my opinion, it was the introduction of machinery, and the superabundance of manufactures beyond what there is a demand for, and the competition of manufacturers; and of course, when they wished to have a large profit in the market, they reduced the wages, and so brought them down to the present price.

89. Are the poor laws in operation in Glasgow?—They are not.

90. Is there no cess in Glasgow for the relief of the poor?—There is no legal claim, that I know of.

91. Is there not a parochial cess in cases of great distress?—There is a church contribution, but they will not give it the name of a cess.

92. Do you know the barony parish in Glasgow?—Yes.

93. Are you not aware that there was a demand made upon the poor fund of that parish by certain Irish people in the year 1824?—No, I do not recollect that.

94. You have stated, that your masters give you so much wages; are you not aware that the wages are necessarily regulated by the number of persons applying for work?—Yes, we consider that they are generally regulated by that.

95. Do you not individually feel that the wages that are given to you are necessarily dependant upon the number of labourers willing to work at low wages?—I consider they are.

96. If you individually were to ask for a higher rate of wages, would not your master tell you that he could obtain other persons that would work at a lower rate, and that consequently he could not give you higher wages?—Certainly.

97. Are not the circumstances of the trade at Glasgow such, that the wages you receive are little more than are necessary to maintain the artisan in a certain degree of health; that is, could the artisan work as long as he does, if he received less wages than he now does?—The wages that he now receives are not sufficient to procure a sufficient quantity of the coarsest food that is used by human beings.

98. If, under any circumstances, this coarse food were to become cheaper than it now is, the number of labourers remaining the same, do you not imagine that they would be obliged to take a lower rate of wages, provided they could obtain precisely the same quantity of coarse food with that lower rate of wages which they do now with the higher rate of wages?—Certainly they would; it would be no advantage to us.

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.
30 February,
1837.

99. Why do you think so?—It would be no advantage, in this way; our masters would just say, We can get it wrought by others; there are three workers for every one that is needed; he would say, This man will do it for a trifle less, and I must employ him instead of you; and a few months would bring it to the same thing.

100. What would it come to at last?—That I cannot tell.

101. Would it not come to the smallest amount at which a weaver can afford to live?—It has come to that at present.

102. Do you know whether the power-loom manufacturers have been fully employed?—They were not a short time ago, but they are generally employed now.

103. You cannot speak positively as to their situation?—With respect to the wages they earn, I have a general knowledge of their situation.

104. Do any of them belong to your society?—None of them.

105. Having come to the determination of emigrating to America, what has been the expectation that you and your friends have formed, as to the situation in which you would be placed when you got there?—We expected that His Majesty's Government, with the assistance of Parliament, would give a grant of land, and the means of occupying it, with a passage out, and this is what we have petitioned Parliament for.

106. When you say that, do you mean that each individual family is to get a separate grant of land, and separate assistance from Parliament?—Yes.

107. Have you had an opportunity of reading the Report and Evidence of the Emigration Committee?—We have had; we read extracts and papers from it; that portion of them that related more directly to us.

108. You understand, generally, the nature of the principal assistance that has been given to the emigrants that went out in 1823?—We do.

109. If you had your choice, would you prefer, from what you have heard from your relation in Canada, to go out without assistance and take your chance of prospering, or to receive assistance upon the principles that are explained in the Report and the Evidence of the Emigration Committee, and to make yourself liable for the repayment of any money that might be advanced to you for that purpose?—We would certainly prefer to receive assistance, and make ourselves liable for the repayment of the money.

110. Would you willingly consent to an arrangement which should make your land a security for such repayment?—Yes.

111. For example, if you were to be settled in the proportion of a man and woman and three children upon one hundred acres, more or less, in Upper Canada, and you were not to be called upon to pay interest, or to pay any money for seven years, would you undertake to pay five per cent interest for the money so advanced to you, until the period arrived at which you could pay the principal?—Undoubtedly we would undertake to pay that which it was in our power to pay; we do not know the nature of the place, and the success we should meet with, but we would undertake to pay whatever sum it was possible for men of industrious habits to pay, for the purpose of repaying what we had received.

112. You would consider, that provided you received assistance, and had ample time given you for you to be placed in a situation in which you had the means of doing it, no sort of injustice would be done you in calling upon you to pay interest for the money advanced?—No; we would consider that, both from gratitude and justice, we were bound to pay it.

113. Do you think that would be the general impression of the persons you have mentioned?—I am certain it would; we have repeatedly talked of it, and I am quite prepared to give their opinion upon that subject.

114. Would you be willing, on receiving your allotment of land, to mortgage that allotment to the public as a security for the repayment of the money?—Certainly; we understood that that was generally the case.

115. Do you understand that you would not have the legal possession of that property, so as to be able to alienate it, till you had paid the whole or part of the debt?—We understand that perfectly.

116. You would be content to receive it upon those terms?—Yes.

117. In short, you would be perfectly willing to consent to any arrangement which did not require of you more than what, if you were industrious and well conducted, you might reasonably expect that you should be able to perform?—We would receive it with the greatest gratitude upon those terms.

118. The

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.

30 February,
1827.

118. The question does not refer to your purchasing your land, but to paying back that money which is necessary to be advanced for the purpose of transporting you to Canada, and placing you in a situation in which you would be able to prosper in that country?—Certainly.

119. You, of course, would be liable to any local taxes in that country, that the laws of that country might impose?—No doubt of it, we are aware that they are necessary to a certain extent.

120. Have you any relation or friend who has emigrated to the United States?—I have, but it is a long time back; I have had no communication with him.

121. You do not know any person that has emigrated to the United States from Glasgow or Paisley?—No.

122. If you went to America, and the option was given you of gaining your livelihood in some manufacture or trade, should you prefer that instead of taking to agricultural pursuits?—We, as a society, are determined, and my own opinion, as an individual, is the same, not to meddle with manufacture; we are quite disgusted with it, and tired of it.

123. You have referred to your brother in Upper Canada; will you inform the Committee of the condition in which his last account represent him to be?—His address is, the head of Long Sault, on the Ottawa. He said that he had a considerable portion of land cleared, he did not name what; he said that he had some cattle, and with the produce of his own farm and land, and a little he had purchased likewise, he waited a few months on the canal, and sold it to those who were digging it, and that he got a turn of money which was particularly serviceable to assist him in getting on in the world.

124. Do you know how much money he had when he went out?—He had but a very few pounds, eight or ten pounds, after paying all expenses of landing in Canada.

125. Had he any other aid from government but the grant of the land?—He did get implements of agriculture likewise, and some other assistance.

126. Had he any money assistance?—He did not say exactly, but he said that he fell into a great error in not going out of this country upon the government grant, and had he not by some means obtained some assistance, he would have been in embarrassed circumstances.

127. Did he pay his own passage?—Yes.

128. Was he alone, except his wife and children?—There were his wife and children and himself.

129. Do you know what his passage cost him?—He paid, I think, five pounds each passenger.

130. Was that for passage and provisions?—For passage and provisions, and he took a certain portion of provisions with him.

131. Was he landed in Quebec for that?—He was.

132. Have you or any of your society made any estimate of the expense of going out to Canada?—We have not; we looked at the general list of expense that it cost in 1820 and 1821, and we thought that probably it might be modified, but we have not made an estimate.

133. What do you understand the expense to have been in 1820 and 1821?—I think it was 6*l.* for each passenger.

134. To what extent could persons connected with your society pay the expense of conveying themselves to Canada?—As a body I think they could pay nothing; but we applied to a number of wealthy and respectable citizens, we told them of our embarrassed circumstances, and we solicited their assistance in forming a fund to provide clothes and other necessities; they said they would in part assist us, and a number of them have subscribed, and others have promised they will yet do more when we are enabled to avail ourselves of it; they have subscribed something for the purpose of clothing and other necessities.

135. Are the subscriptions they have entered into, for the express purpose of facilitating your emigration, or for general charity?—For facilitating our emigration, undoubtedly.

136. Supposing arrangements to be made for giving you in Canada grants of land, with some assistance in forming your settlements, by giving you tools and other things, do you think that persons desirous of emigrating could, either by their own means or through the assistance of their wealthier neighbours, be able to convey themselves to Canada at their own expense?—We think not.

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.

50 February,
1837.

137. Do you think, if it were ascertained that provision was made there for their reception and their establishment upon the land, that persons desirous of emigrating would not be able to muster sufficient means, either of their own or by the aid of those disposed to assist them, to take them out?—We think not.

138. You have said, that every person of your society that was disposed to go to America, had the expectation of obtaining a grant of land; have you any idea that emigrants would be found willing to go for the purpose of offering their labour to others, without having a special grant of land to each party that went?—There are none of our association that seem to wish it; their object is to obtain a grant of land, so as to become independent by their own industry.

139. If the Committee understood you correctly, you stated, in a former part of your examination, that you would prefer to receive assistance, not in money but in kind, at the time of your location in Canada, and to make yourself and your land responsible for the repayment of the expense so incurred for you, rather than to be sent over to that country without any sort of demand upon you for the future, not receiving that species of assistance, but taking the chance of prospering, either as labourers or as colonists?—We are quite determined in our mind that we should accept of the grant of land and support from government, and repay it, in preference to the other plan; indeed we consider there is no comparison between the two, for our chance of succeeding in that case would be so much better.

140. To the extent, therefore, of the repayment of what it may be necessary to advance to you, to put you in a condition to become independent in Canada, and paying the interest upon it till that repayment took place, you think that those who have sent you here are unanimous in opinion with you, as to the preference of accepting assistance for the purpose of emigration on those terms?—I am quite certain they are.

141. And you yourself, and those who are embarked with you in this attempt to obtain relief, think that repayment upon those principles is just and fair and equitable?—We do.

142. Is it the object of your society to go out together, so as to be settled in one neighbourhood, or in one village?—Yes, it is the object of a great proportion of them.

143. Do you imagine that if you were collected together into one neighbourhood, there would be a certain degree of influence exercised, that would make them more careful to maintain good conduct and honesty, than if they were among strangers?—We are certain it would; and, as an individual, I think it would.

144. Do you think that you could more materially assist each other, if you were all collected together into little villages, than if you were scattered abroad?—Yes; out of our society we would select our associates and friends, and be serviceable to each other.

145. Before the persons composing this society made up their minds to wish to leave their native country, you of course made inquiries whether you could find occupation in any other trade besides weaving, in Scotland?—We have, and we see no prospect of it.

146. Have you made diligent inquiries as to other trades, in your native country?—We have.

147. And you can find no opening for employment in Scotland?—We cannot; I have a boy who has been weaving three or four years, and I have been two years looking out, and I cannot find an opening to put him in another trade, though I have equal influence with other working men.

148. Of course, all the members of that society, if they could find an opening in their native country, would prefer it?—Yes, but they see no possibility of doing it; they have no hope but of going to Canada.

149. If you had the power of going there, what part of the North American colonies would you prefer to be located in?—In Upper Canada; they have not particularly fixed upon any part of it, but it was the general opinion of the society, that they would prefer Upper Canada.

150. Is there any thing else you wish to state to the Committee?—I wish to state one thing with respect to the peculiar situation of those who are disposed to go to Canada, with whom we are connected: they take their houses from year to year, commencing on the 25th of May, they bargain for those houses at what is called Martinmas, in November, consequently there are none of them that have taken their houses for the ensuing year; and on the 25th of May, at twelve o'clock, every individual of those will be without a house, without furniture, without working implements.

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.

20 February,
1827.

implements, and without the means of following their trade; consequently they who have been waiting with patience, some of them for several years and the whole of them for one year, will be seized with all the horrors of despair, if they do not get to Canada this spring, or this summer. This is one thing that I was desired to state to this honourable Committee; and likewise we were authorized to make our appeal to some of the gentlemen and noblemen of our country, in point of subscription, to follow up this object; this was part of our errand in coming here; but in particular I was authorized to state, and I am happy to have it in my power to call the attention of this honourable Committee to that circumstance, that at that period, and even before it, they will be in that state; they are now beginning almost to despair, when the season is so far advanced, and nothing is decided upon, and no arrangements made for the ensuing year; it is bordering on desperation with some of them at present.

151. Though the situation you describe is that of the one hundred and forty heads of families composing this Emigration Society, is it a situation peculiar to those persons?—It is peculiar to them in no other way than that they have had their attention turned to it previous to others in Lanarkshire, and that they have a little money subscribed to provide clothing and other necessities, which no others, to my knowledge, have; but it is peculiar in no other point; there are hundreds of others in similar circumstances.

152. Can you form any idea of the probable number of hand-loom weavers in Glasgow and Paisley?—In Glasgow and the suburbs there were 11,000 looms going; among those of course there are boys and girls.

153. What are at the present time the average net earnings of each hand weaver by the week, on an average?—I should say 5*s.* 6*d.*

154. What is the house-rent of each individual by the half year, upon the average?—It depends upon the house they occupy, it is from three to four pounds; the place of working for one weaver is one pound, not included; they have their house and shop besides that.

155. Are not the greater proportion of the house-rents of those weavers now in arrear?—They are.

156. Consequently they are at the mercy of their landlords, and may be ejected?—They are just at their mercy; almost every individual of them is in arrear.

157. Is it the practice of the manufacturers of Glasgow to have homes and workshops, which they let out to the weavers they themselves employ?—No, it is not the general practice.

158. Are the houses they occupy frequently wholly independent of the master manufacturers?—Yes.

159. If Government were to consent to make grants of land to those 140 heads of families of which your society consists, do you think you could find any means of getting assistance to take you there and to settle you there?—We could not, it is quite impossible.

160. Even if those 140 were provided for, you are understood to state that the situation of all the other hand weavers in Glasgow is as desperate as that of those 140?—There are numbers of them as desperate.

161. Can you form any opinion whether if five hundred or a thousand were abstracted from the present population of your neighbourhood, there would be sufficient work for the remainder?—Not at good wages; they could not obtain good wages supposing one half or two thirds were taken, but they would find work more readily.

162. You do not think there would be work at fair wages even for one-third of the existing population?—I think not, from the cause I before mentioned, *viz.* the machinery.

163. What sort of food forms the principal subsistence of the weavers?—Oatmeal and potatoes, and probably a little salt herring or something of that kind; a number of them have not a sufficient quantity of that.

164. How many hand weavers are there in Glasgow and Paisley?—Generally speaking, I might say 15,000 in Glasgow and Paisley.

165. Even if 500 hands were removed, and the power-loom were improved from time to time as rapidly as it has been improved for the last two years, do you not imagine that the removal of 500 hands would produce no effect by creating any fresh demand for hand labour?—I think it would not; I think the machinery would just absorb the whole business.

Joseph Foster
and
James Little.

20 February,
1827.

166. You say that the power loom is not yet perfect, but that it is constantly being improved?—It is constantly being improved.

167. Of how many hand weavers can one pair of power-looms do the work, in the course of the day?—It is at least equal to six.

168. And the work of one girl upon a pair of power-looms is sufficient?—It is; one man looking over thirty or forty or fifty of those girls, and keeping the materials in order.

169. If the number of hand-loom weavers were diminished, and the wages of the remaining number increased, would not the price of the manufactured article be also increased?—I think, from the nature of the power loom, as I said before, taking up all the business, the price of the manufactured article cannot be increased.

170. If it were increased, it would check the sale of the manufactured article?—It would.

171. And therefore it would, in your opinion, make the situation of the hand-loom weaver as bad as before?—I think that it cannot be increased, from the quantity of work performed by the power loom; just in proportion as the demand increases, in that proportion the power looms will increase.

172. Which is the cheapest, a piece of goods made by a power-loom or a piece of goods made by a hand loom?—A power-loom is the cheapest.

Jovis, 22^a die Februarii, 1827.

Archibald Campbell, Esq.

a Member of the Committee; was Examined.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

22 February,
1827.

173. HAVE you had an opportunity of reading the evidence given before this Committee on Tuesday last, by the two deputies from the Glasgow Emigration Society?—I have.

174. Does your information enable you to concur in the statement they have made?—In the fullest manner; I concur in every fact stated by the people that were examined.

175. Are you enabled to inform the Committee of the extent to which distress, of a similar nature, exists in any part of Scotland?—I can speak more particularly with reference to Renfrewshire, than with reference to any part of Lanarkshire. Here is a Statement of the number of families, distinguishing the ages of the children who are seeking to emigrate from the county of Renfrew.

[The same was delivered in, and read, as follows:]

ABSTRACT

ABSTRACT of the Number of Persons composing the following Societies in the County of Renfrew, who have petitioned for aid to enable them to emigrate to the British Possessions in North America; made up by direction of the Lord Lieutenant of Renfreeshire, January 1827.

Name of Society.	Heads of Families:		Male Children:			Total Number of Male Children.	Female Children:			Total Female Children.	Total Number of Persons.
	Men.	Women.	Under 15 Years of Age.	Above 15, & under 20.	Above 20 Years of Age.		Under 15 Years of Age.	Above 15, & under 20.	Above 20 Years of Age.		
Paisley Friendly Emigration Society, N° 1.	100	96	138	72	15	225	122	47	16	185	606
Paisley Caledonian d° d°	54	53	64	38	10	112	63	16	16	89	203
Paisley & Suburbs d° d°	56	56	61	30	5	96	58	21	7	87	195
Paisley Caledonian d° d°	112	105	146	81	26	353	195	55	28	268	696
Paisley Caledonian-street d° d°	26	27	30	9	8	66	35	8	1	44	153
The Irish Friendly d° d°	101	99	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	576*
Elderslie Emigration d°	50	50	70	44	-	114	44	53	-	97	211
Barrhead & Neilston d° d°	43	43	46	27	6	79	44	19	14	77	249
Brownland - - d° d°	66	64	84	45	16	145	62	31	6	99	374
Hibernian Protest ^d d° d°	60	59	68	46	9	173	48	31	8	88	330
Govan Emigration d° -	50	48	42	28	10	80	52	35	8	95	273
Paisley Friendly d° N° 2	60	60	76	39	20	146	64	24	22	110	386
Johnston Emigration d° -	15	15	26	13	11	50	18	18	7	43	153
Total - -	793	775	830	423	126	1,479	736	269	125	1,330	4,653

* 576 The Return made by this Society does not distinguish the numbers of Male and Female Children; but the numbers of Children, Male and Female, are,

Under 15	-	-	-	-	171
Above 15	-	-	-	-	205
					376

176. Do those societies consist of hand-loom weavers?—I believe they do, entirely.

177. Can you explain to the Committee what district they extend over?—They extend over the whole of the county of Renfrew; a great number of them that are resident in the villages, are employed partly in agriculture.

178. Are there many of them in some degree accustomed to agricultural habits?—Yes.

179. Are you prepared to give the Committee any details respecting any other persons similarly situated in that part of the kingdom?—I know there are a great number in the adjoining county of Lanark, who are also petitioning for assistance to emigrate. There are likewise various societies in the county of Renfrew, for whom Mr. Maxwell, the member for the county, has presented petitions.

180. Do you think that those people for the most part are aware of the nature of the country and of the labour that will be required of them?—I think they are, from the correspondence that took place between them and the emigrants that went out some years ago, whose reports with regard to their situation have been extremely favourable; I have seen many letters from those settlers who went out in 1820, that gave a very favourable account of their situation in Upper Canada.

181. You think they are aware of the nature of the difficulties they will have to encounter, and are ready to meet them?—I think they are, generally.

182. Do you consider that there is any opportunity at present of their being employed in their own country, in such a manner as to obtain wages of labour by which they can support themselves?—I think not.

A. Campbell,
Esq.22 February,
1827.

183. Is it a prevailing opinion in that part of the country, that there is no early likelihood of such a state of things occurring, as to give employment to those people?—There are many various opinions upon the subject, and things are improving just at this moment; almost every weaver in that part of the country is employed, and wages are rising.

184. Have you an opportunity of stating to the Committee what is the present rate of wages?—No.

185. Is it the general opinion in that part of the country, that the influx of Irish has tended to throw these people out of employment?—It certainly has; but lately great numbers of the Irish have been removed; we gave them passages back to their own country, taking an exact description of them, to prevent their having recourse to our funds again. I have here a copy of the last report of the sub-committee of the county of Renfrew for the relief of unemployed operatives.

[The same was delivered in, and read, as follows:]

" Report by the Sub-committee of the county of Renfrew for the relief of the unemployed Operatives.

" The number of families dependent on the committee, at the date of the last report, was - - - - - 1,361

The number at this date is - - - - - 1,245

The decrease, during the week, is - - - - - 116

Sums to the amount of 40*l.* have been allotted by the Committee to several of the remotest districts of the county where distress still exists, and the other expenditure of the week has amounted to 210*l.* Several small donations have been recently received, and the fund remaining on hand, at this date, is 1,040*l.*"

" Preses. Council Chambers, Paisley, (signed) "Robt. Farquharson."

" 15th February 1827."

186. Have you had an opportunity of hearing lately from any person who is competent to speak with authority upon the state of that part of the country?—I have a letter, which I received this day by post from the chief magistrate of Paisley, which contains the following passage, "I am most happy to say that matters are, as far as regards the weavers, still improving; the work plenty, with wages advancing; but the labourers, and I may say all other operatives, are very ill off."

187. Are those Irish that come over from Belfast chiefly weavers, or are they common labourers?—Those that come to Paisley are chiefly weavers; the labourers are generally employed in the more western part of Scotland; in Ayrshire and Wigtonshire there are a great many Irish labourers, but we have not a great many Irish labourers in Renfrewshire.

188. Do you know where they come from?—Mostly from the north, I believe; about Belfast, I think, is the chief part.

189. Have you any means of estimating the comparative rate of wages paid to the hand weavers, and to the power-loom weavers?—No.

190. Have many of those weavers, to your knowledge, been employed in road making, and other hard labour out of doors, during the time of the distress?—A great many have been employed in making roads, and in various other occupations, deepening rivers, &c.

191. Has it been found that they were able to endure that labour as well as the common labourers of the country?—The summer was exceedingly favourable; but if it had been as wet a season as we usually have, they would all have been in the hospital.

192. Are those emigration societies, of which you have given a list, composed entirely of unemployed operatives?—I believe entirely of the operatives unemployed, or partially employed.

193. They consist in no degree of persons who have funds of their own, able to assist in the object of emigrating?—All of them that I have seen, and I have communication with most of the societies of Renfrewshire, have declared that they cannot contribute one shilling towards their own emigration.

194. Have you any reason to suppose that if assistance were given by government to those persons to emigrate, it would be met by corresponding assistance from private or public funds, in the neighbourhood from which they came?—I have not.

195. You

195. You think that no sum could be raised?—If any, it would be so trifling a sum, that it would be of very little consequence.

196. Is there any thing practically in the nature of a parochial rate in Renfrewshire for the relief of the poor?—No; there is something very similar in one or two of the town parishes, where they have been obliged to call for voluntary assessment.

197. In point of fact, with respect to those distressed operatives who are out of employment, and who have no means of their own, from what fund does their support proceed?—The rate of expenditure of the relief committee at Paisley amounted weekly to 500*l.* all furnished by voluntary subscription, not alone in that particular county, but we have received large sums from the London Relief Committee; we have expended since the 1st of March last, I think, 22,000*l.*

198. Have you any opportunity of knowing the number of persons to whom that 22,000*l.* has been dispensed?—It varied almost every week; the number of families, I believe, was as high as 2,600 at one time; they have been gradually diminishing, for some weeks.

199. Does that 22,000*l.* apply to Renfrewshire alone?—To Renfrewshire alone; we have no communication with any other county.

200. Do you happen to know whether the majority of persons receiving relief from this fund, are Scotch or Irish?—The greater proportion are Scotch; there are still some Irish that have been in the country for a long time, and are in a manner established there, who have gained what would be called in this country a settlement.

201. In Scotland there is no law of removal?—No.

202. Does not three years continued residence give a settlement in Scotland?—It does.

203. Do you know the Abbey parish in Paisley?—Perfectly.

204. Do you remember, in 1819, an application being made by 825 able-bodied men for relief, on account of the stagnation of trade in that parish?—I cannot say that I recollect the exact circumstances; I know there was a question arose upon an application from certain people claiming a right to relief; but what decision there was upon that, or whether there ever was any decision, I do not remember; I think the thing is not decided now.

205. Was not the application to the kirk session in the first instance refused, and was there not upon that an appeal to the sheriff?—That I recollect.

206. Did not the sheriff in that case, make an order on the kirk session to assess themselves for the relief of those 825 persons?—I do not recollect.

207. You say that you have seen favourable accounts from some persons who have settled in the northern provinces of America; are you aware of the extent of assistance from government that those settlers received?—I am not.

208. Can you state whether the appointment of this Committee has created much expectation among the heads of families composing those emigration societies in Renfrewshire, that they are to get relief from government to carry them to America?—There is no doubt that very sanguine expectations have been raised in consequence of the report of the Committee that sat in the last year.

209. You have stated, that it is the general opinion in Renfrewshire, that no early opportunity will occur of employing those persons who are now in a state of distress; you have also stated, that the sum of 22,000*l.* has been expended in their support, such sum arising from local and voluntary subscriptions; have you any reason to suppose, under the existing circumstances of that part of Scotland, that in the ensuing year those parties can be sustained at a less expense than what has been incurred in the last?—I should hope at infinitely less, from the appearance of the revival of trade; and the weavers are at this moment, as I stated before from the authority of the chief magistrate, now in work, all of them, and wages are advancing.

210. You conceive that the pressure upon the other classes is of a temporary nature?—I conceive so.

211. You have stated, that a great number of the Irish have been sent back from Renfrewshire to their own country, and that means have been taken to prevent their return; will you have the goodness to state more in detail the nature of those means?—When we gave an Irishman a ticket upon a steam boat, to carry him back, and a loaf to subsist upon for the day, we took an exact description of his person, and assured him, that if he returned, he would not be entitled to any relief from our funds.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

22 February,
1827.

212. Is not that decision against relieving those Irish, in the event of their return, equally operative against any other Irish who may come, provided sufficient publicity were given to that resolution?—I have no doubt it might operate in that manner.

213. Are you speaking now of relief afforded according to law, or of relief afforded by voluntary subscription?—Of relief afforded by voluntary subscription entirely.

214. Do you consider that there is any relief imposed by law, in the case of Irish people coming into Renfrewshire?—Those that have been settled there for three years, I think, have the same claim for relief that the natives have.

215. In the case therefore of fresh Irish arriving, until they have been there three years they would have no legal claim for relief?—Certainly not.

216. It is three years continued residence that gives a right to relief, in Scotland?—So I understand.

217. Can you inform the Committee what proportion of the 22,000*l.* which was raised for the relief of those persons, was raised by voluntary contributions on the spot, and what proportion was received from the London Relief Committee?—

ABSTRACT of the Receipts and Expenditure of the Committee of the County of *Renfrew*, appointed for the Relief of the Unemployed Operative Manufacturers, to the 22d of February 1827.

RECEIVED:		£.	s.	d.
From The King	- - - - -	500	-	-
From the London Relief Committee	- - - - -	8,000	-	-
From the Edinburgh Relief Committee	- - - - -	4,600	-	-
From the Committee of the County of Haddington	- - - - -	300	-	-
From the Newcastle Committee	- - - - -	150	-	-
From the Glasgow Committee	- - - - -	395	-	-
Amount of local Subscriptions, and other private pecuniary donations, proceeds of Church Collections, Charity Balls and Concerts, and Receipts for Work performed	- - - - -	7,923	19	3
EXPENDED:		21,868	19	3
In Wages for out-door labour provided by the Committee, and in distribution of Provisions, Coals and small pecuniary aid	- - - - - £ 19,561 11 3			
In providing Clothing	- - - - - 1,399 8 -			
Balance in Treasurer's hands, } 22d February - - - }	- - - - - 908 - -			
		21,868	19	3

N. B.—Besides the above Account, various Noblemen and Gentlemen of the county have expended very large sums in giving work and provisions to the unemployed residing contiguous to their respective estates. There have also been considerable Contributions raised and applied within several of the Parishes; and several thousand articles of Clothing sent by private individuals to the several depots have been distributed. The Coalmasters in the neighbourhood have also from time to time gratuitously given large quantities of Coals.

The average weekly pecuniary Expenditure of the Committee, from the commencement up to the 22d February, has been £ 410, and the average weekly number of families dependent on them has been 2,030.

218. What is the class of persons at the present moment receiving relief from the local funds?—The chief demand upon the Paisley relief fund at present is from widows and orphan families; the men in general have been struck off.

219. If one thousand weavers were removed from Glasgow and its neighbourhood, and wages rose, have you any doubt that the vacuum so created would be filled up from Ireland in a very short time?—I entertain not the least doubt upon the

the subject. I have here a letter which I received a few days ago from the central committee of the Emigration societies of Renfrewshire.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

[The same was delivered in, and read, as follows:]

22 February,
1827.

"Honored Sir,

"1, Barclay Street,
Paisley, 10 February 1827."

"PREVIOUS to your presenting our Petition, it may not perhaps be improper to state to you more fully than hitherto the true situation we are placed in, in order that you may be prepared, when the subject of Emigration is discussing in Parliament, to urge the advantage it will be to us if sent out early in the season. For although the severe distress we are now in is well known to the Honorable House of which you are a member, it may not have occurred to their minds the extent that that distress will reach when the term (28th of May) shall have expired.

"It has been utterly impossible for us to pay this year any rent to our landlords, consequently the little property we now possess, becomes theirs; and we cannot expect that they will let us houses for another term. We have no other prospect but that we shall be turned to the streets, without a blanket to cover either ourselves or children, or implements to work at our trades; besides, should our landlords be even so lenient as to grant us in that desolate state their houses for another, still we are incurring a debt of a whole year's rent, for no houses are let for a shorter period in Renfrewshire.

"May your Honor therefore take our case into mature consideration, and on presenting our Petitions urge the necessity of sending us away previous to the above stated period.

We are, Honored Sir,

With great respect,

Your very humble Servants,

(For the Central Committee of the Emigration
Societies of Renfrewshire.)

"Archibald Campbell, Esq. M. P.
London."

Adam Millar, Secretary."

Thomas Francis Kennedy, Esq. a Member of the House; Examined.

220. WHAT is the part of Scotland with which you are best acquainted?—I profess to speak only respecting the county of Ayr, and I do not wish the Committee to understand that I possess by any means complete information even as to the whole of that county.

T. F. Kennedy,
E

221. Are there any persons in that neighbourhood who have expressed a desire to emigrate to America?—I yesterday presented to the House three Petitions from persons desiring assistance for that object in a very earnest manner. I do not believe that those Petitions by any means express the opinion of the entire body of persons desiring to emigrate; I should suppose that if there were any chance of sufficient aid being afforded, that number would be very greatly increased; and I state this opinion, because I know the class of persons from whom those Petitions come, are slow to petition on any subject, it not being their habit to interfere by addressing themselves to Parliament unless in very urgent circumstances.

222. What is the number of the Petitioners, and of what class of persons are they composed?—I think that the number of heads of families included in those three Petitions amounts to ninety-two, and they are operative manufacturers in cotton weaving.

223. Are they employed at hand-loom weaving?—Hand-loom weaving; persons whose work comes from Glasgow, being sent a very considerable distance into the country to be performed; and of course the greater the distance from Glasgow, the more quickly are they sensible of any depression in the trade in which they are engaged.

224. Have they been for any time in great distress?—I should say that the distress has been urgent for about a year.

225. Have the gentlemen in that part of the country afforded them any relief?—A very great degree of local relief has been afforded, besides assistance received from the London and Edinburgh Commissioners; and I think I may safely say that the people themselves would bear testimony to the humane treatment which they have received, and in saying this I am happy to add my distinct and strong testimony in

favour

T. F. Kennedy,
Esq.

22 February,
1847.

favour of the excellent conduct of all those persons, without exception, who have come within my observation during the period of distress to which I refer.

226. Do you conceive that those persons have any knowledge of the difficulties they are likely to encounter, when they propose to emigrate to America?—I should think it very unlikely that they should be thoroughly aware of the difficulties they may encounter; at the same time, the county of Ayr is a part of the country from which persons have often proceeded to America, and therefore I by no means imagine that they are entirely ignorant either of the disadvantages or comparative comforts which might arise from their being sent to that country.

227. Do you conceive that the gentlemen in that part of the country, or the individuals who have signed those petitions, would be willing to contribute largely to the expense of their removal to America?—With respect to the parties signing the petitions, I apprehend they are quite incapable of contributing any thing, being possessed of no property whatever. With respect to the landholders in the neighbourhood where they live, I should extremely doubt their making any contribution, because they have already made great sacrifices, and there is a considerable pressure upon the upper ranks in that country; and also, there being no established poor-rate in the country, the case is entirely different from that of a country where persons would, by such contribution, find themselves relieved from a heavy burthen which they actually pay. There is, no doubt, a pressure and a burthen arising from the sufferings of the lower orders, but there is not a large regular payment in the shape of a parochial rate. I never recollect so great a scarcity of labour and money among the labouring classes of all denominations.

228. If those ninety heads of families were removed, do you conceive that it would make any lasting reduction in the population of that neighbourhood, or would supplies of people come immediately from other places to fill up the vacuum so created?—Those ninety heads of families, I apprehend, form a very small proportion of the population who are at present in distress; if they were removed, and if there arose a comparative prosperity in the trade, there can be no doubt that the space created by their removal would be instantaneously filled up.

229. By what class of persons?—Very possibly by some of the native inhabitants resorting to a new trade, becoming cotton weavers instead of following their present pursuits, which may not be profitable at the present time, all occupations being in a very depressed condition; but above all, the space would be instantaneously filled up by the resort of Irish to that part of the country. When I make this statement with respect to the Irish, I wish to guard myself in the most positive manner against being supposed to express any opinion in disparagement of the Irish who come in our part of the country, because I must say that their conduct, generally speaking, is good, and that the country has derived very great benefits from the labour they have afforded; at the same time that the excess of the influx of that population undoubtedly is a source of great calamity to us now, and is not a source, I am sorry to say, of advantage to those poor people themselves.

230. Do you find that in changing the habits of the original inhabitants of the country for the habits of the Irish population, who under this supposition would take the place of the original inhabitants, you make a satisfactory change?—I am sorry to say that within my memory there has unquestionably been a great deterioration of the character of our population; I ascribe it partly to the manufacturing occupation; and undoubtedly I do not think that the habits of many of the Irish that have come have been advantageous to our native population; and in particular I would take this opportunity of stating my regret that they have sometimes brought with them, not only their labour, but their religious associations, which have been productive of considerable discomfort in the part of the country in which I live: I allude to a practice in particular, which to my own knowledge has been productive even of crime; I mean the habit of processions, which have no kind of connexion with the habits of our part of the country, but which have been productive of quarrelling and serious misunderstanding.

231. What sort of processions do you refer to?—Orange processions.

232. Do you think that the appointment of this Committee is likely to create an expectation among the persons desirous of emigrating in your part of the country that they are to get great assistance from Government to enable them to go to America?—There can be no question that the petitions I have presented are founded upon a hope that something of the sort may be done; and there can be as little doubt that the reference of those petitions to a Committee expressly appointed upon that subject, must excite a very general hope and expectation.

233. You

T. F. Kennedy,
Esq.
23 February,
1827.

233. You have said that a poor-rate does not exist in Scotland; upon the failure of voluntary contributions, is not both personal and real property rateable for the relief of the poor?—There can be no doubt that, according to the ancient law of Scotland, personal and real property is rateable for the poor; in different parts of the country a different practice has arisen; I believe, in very populous places and in the burder counties, a practice has arisen not very dissimilar to the practice of England, namely, that a legal and compulsory assessment has been established; but in the part of the country to which I wish that my evidence should be considered to apply, we cannot be said to have any compulsory relief for the poor; at the same time, that on many occasions the proprietors of land come forward in a very liberal manner with a voluntary contribution, in order to avoid what they apprehend would be the consequence, if refused, namely, that measures would be taken to compel them to give extensive relief to the poor.

234. Are you aware of the decision that was come to in the barony parish in Glasgow, about the year 1823, to give no aid to any Irish?—I recollect that there was a case which was considered to be of great importance, about the period mentioned, and I believe that the decision of the local authority, namely, the heritors and kirk session of that parish, went to the refusal of relief to able-bodied persons saying that they could not obtain work sufficient to maintain them.

235. The case alluded to is a case between the heritors of the Barony parish and an Irishman of the name of Higgins; do you happen to remember the case?—I believe that is the case to which I advert.

236. That decision was appealed from to the Court of Session?—I believe it was.

237. Do you remember the decision of the Court of Session upon that case?—My impression is, that the decision went to reverse the judgment of the local court, and to find that the personal and real property of that parish could be made liable in support of able-bodied persons saying they were in a state of destitution.

238. Whether they were Irish or natives, provided that, if they were Irish, they had by a continued residence of three years obtained a settlement?—Without distinction, if each party had obtained a settlement according to the law of the country. I wish to state, that the law of Scotland is, in my opinion, in an uncertain, but at the same time in what I should term a very hazardous state; I believe that the decision of the Court of Session, to which I have adverted, was considered to be a decision of so alarming a nature, that it has since been called in question; and if I were to offer an opinion to the Committee, I should say that I have some doubt whether that decision would be adhered to if the same question came to be considered on another occasion, although while I say so, I confess that I extremely dread the ultimate establishment, in the courts of law, of the principle laid down in the decision with respect to the barony parish of Glasgow.

239. As the law now stands, with the decisions of the Court of Session to which you have alluded, and which as yet have not been reversed or appealed from, do you consider a pauper in Scotland, whether native Scotch, or Irish, having obtained a settlement, a beggar of charity, or a creditor on a fund of which the kirk session and the heritors are accountable trustees?—So far as my knowledge and memory extend, I believe that the balance of the decisions in the courts of Scotland went to establish the right of such a pauper; but I at the same time wish to state, that if I were called upon, as a possessor of property in any parish, to pay under the law in support of able-bodied men, I should unquestionably resist the application, and defend myself from the demand made upon my property, because I consider that the support of the able-bodied persons is contrary to the original intent of the law, and ought not to be sustained in the courts of law.

240. You are aware that in England real property only is rateable for the relief of the poor?—I am.

241. Under the law of Scotland, is our personal property, wherever situated, rateable, as well as real property, in aid of parochial burdens?—I believe that some very strong decisions of the court have been given to the effect of rendering personal property liable, wherever situated; but I am also aware that that part of the law of Scotland is in a very unsettled state, and that important cases are now under consideration of the supreme court in Scotland.

242. But as yet none of the decisions of the Court of Session have been appealed from, or reversed, in the House of Lords?—Not that I am aware of.

243. On what points do you consider that the uncertainty in the law of Scotland consists, respecting the laws affecting the poor?—My opinion is, that the original intent of the law was, that the aged and infirm should alone receive aid; that principle

T. F. Kennedy,
Esq.

22 February,
1837.

ciple has been adhered to rigidly in some districts, in others it has been partially infringed upon or entirely lost sight of; and the great hazard to which Scotland is subjected, is, that the courts of law may proceed to establish the principle of relief to all who say that they are in want. The uncertainty therefore which is the ground of alarm, is the question, who "*the poor*" are—if the aged and infirm only, Scotland would be safe; if all who are, and say they are, in want, then the danger is extreme, and that country will be visited by all the evils which are created by the Poor laws in England, and even more, as personal as well as real property is liable. My opinion is, that there can be no safety but from legislative interference. With respect to the relations between Scotland and Ireland, I should wish to make one observation to the Committee. It appears to me that there is to a certain degree a hardship in the relative situations of the natives of Scotland and of Ireland, in any interchange that may take place between them; an Irishman coming to Scotland, receives a settlement in any parish in Scotland, as good as a native Scotchman possesses, by three years residence, provided, during that period, he lives by his own industry; whereas if a Scotchman goes to Ireland, he receives no settlement whatever, there being no poor law in that country. Now, while I should be the last person to say any thing hostile to a free intercourse between Scotland and Ireland, whether or not any restraint could be imposed upon the extent to which the Irish resort to Scotland, by rendering the law of settlement somewhat more difficult, I am not prepared to say; but I do think it is a point somewhat worthy of consideration, in order, if possible, to restrain the Irish from filling up any vacuum that might be created in the population in Scotland, and to check the evils of redundant population, which arise solely from the resort of Irish to the district of which I speak.

244. In point of fact, there is no law of removal in Scotland?—None whatever, provided a settlement be acquired; and previous to settlement being acquired, no one can be removed merely on suspicion that he is likely to become chargeable.

245. Does not the same observation apply to the relative circumstances of England and Scotland, which you have described to exist with respect to Scotland and Ireland?—Unquestionably; and for that very reason I should think it equally desirable that Scotland should have some slight means of defending itself against the English as well as against the Irish, there being no reciprocity between the law of Scotland respecting settlement, and that of either of the two other countries.

246. Is not the case even harder with regard to England, as by the parochial law of England there is a power of removing the Scotch poor, whereas in the law of Ireland no such power exists?—Most unquestionably; with this material distinction, that the number of English resorting to Scotland, and acquiring settlements, is very small, while the number of Irish who acquire settlements in Scotland is very great.

Henry Howe Drummond, Esq. a Member of the House; Examined.

H. H. Drummond,
Esq.

22 February,
1837.

247. WILL you be good enough to state with what part of Scotland you are more immediately connected?—My residence is not in a manufacturing part of the country; but there is a part of the county I represent, in which manufactures are established to a considerable extent, and accordingly I have had one petition presented to the House, which is now referred to this Committee; viz. from Balfour, in Stirlingshire. It is a petition from ninety-two heads of families, amounting to 155 souls. Those persons are in a very miserable condition, their whole earnings and means of subsistence having of late amounted only to from 4s. to 6s. a week. They apply not only for assistance to enable them to emigrate, but for a portion of land, seed-corn, implements of husbandry, and subsistence till they may be able to raise a crop from the lands assigned to them. They are all persons more or less accustomed to agricultural pursuits; they have been accustomed to the cultivation of small pieces of ground; and I believe them to be persons of excellent character; and I should think they are as well qualified as any description of persons that can be found, for an experiment of this sort.

248. Have the gentlemen in your part of the country been called upon to contribute to the assistance of those persons who are now in distress?—They certainly have, and they have made great exertions in various ways; there have been subscriptions collected in every parish of the county of Stirling, and there have been, besides that, individual subscriptions to a considerable amount made by the gentry in London and in Edinburgh.

249. What is the occupation of those persons who are desirous of emigrating in your part of the country?—Operative cotton weavers, hand-loom weavers.

250. Do you conceive that the gentlemen in your part of the country would be willing to aid those persons in emigrating?—I think very little assistance can be looked for from that quarter, they have made such great exertions already; and I believe there is a feeling that the advantage to themselves and to the country in which they live would be very small from an emigration of that description, for various reasons. They would probably consider that the gap in the population would very soon be filled up from other quarters, and in particular by the influx of Irishmen in the western part of Scotland, who are in fact driving the population of the country out of their employment by working at a cheaper rate than the natives, from their habits, can do.

251. Do you conceive that the exchange of Irishmen for the native population of that part of the country would be a good or a bad exchange?—I think it a great evil; it tends to the depreciation of the moral habits of the people.

252. Do you find the habit of industry of the Irish, and their moral conduct, to be very inferior to that of the native population of that description?—Upon the whole I certainly consider them to be very much inferior.

253. Are they inferior in point of industry?—There are a number of the Irish who are certainly very remarkable for industrious habits; but we remark that there is a degree of unsteadiness about them, as compared with our own people; they will work hard for a time, but then a change takes place, a row or a fight occurs, and they cannot be depended upon for continuing in any settled habit of industry.

254. Do not they work at a lower rate of wages than the Scotch?—Yes, I believe they generally do; but we find that in certain classes of labour, for example in all the lower departments, even in Edinburgh, the labour is carried on by Irishmen; the scavengers and lamplighters, and people of that description, are almost all Irishmen.

255. Are not those Irish, who are now displacing the Scotch labourers, content to live without those decent comforts, the want of which would shame a native Scotchman?—Yes.

256. Have they been the means of introducing religious animosities and feuds into that part of the country?—I have not had any opportunity of observing that; but I know that there have been disturbances in Edinburgh within the last few years, which have been occasioned by the influx of Irish; they take place particularly on Sunday, a day on which the lower orders of the Scotch are not accustomed to any thing of that sort.

257. Have you known any Orange processions in Edinburgh?—No, I have not.

258. You have stated, that if emigration were to take place to any amount from that part of Stirlingshire with which you are acquainted, the vacuum so created would be instantly filled up, either by people flowing in from other parts of the country, or by labourers coming from Ireland; have not the proprietors in that part of the country a discretion of letting the houses, or of refusing to let the houses to which these emigrants go?—A great proportion of the houses in the country villages do not belong to the landed proprietors, but to what we call feuars; that is to say, the house is the actual property of a person who has no other property but that house; and an individual of that inferior station will generally let it to the person that offers him at the moment, without even good security, the highest rent.

259. They belong to a class of persons that do not contribute either in a voluntary or a compulsory manner to the relief of the poor?—In a great measure they do, certainly.

260. Is not personal property as well as real property in Scotland rateable in aid of the parochial funds for the relief of the poor?—It is, but there are very few instances in that part of the country of any legal assessment.

261. Upon the failure of voluntary contributions for that purpose, have you any doubt that, by law, property both real and personal is rateable?—I have no doubt that it is liable.

262. Does it consist with your knowledge that the appointment of this Committee has created much expectation on the part of persons desirous of emigrating, that they are to get considerable assistance from the Government to carry them to North America?—I am inclined to think it has created expectations.

263. Do you think that it has in any degree unsettled their present views of occupation?—I am not aware that it has.

H. H. Drummond,
Esq.
32 February,
1847.

264. Do you think that if wages were to rise there, so as to place them in a better condition, they would still resort to emigration, rather than avail themselves of such rise of wages?—I should be inclined to think they would rather give up all idea of emigration, in those circumstances.

265. Are you aware of the Barony parish case that came before the Court of Session in the year 1824?—I have frequently heard the case mentioned.

266. Do you think that under that decision, an Irishman, having gained a settlement in Scotland, though able-bodied, if he cannot find employment, has at the present moment a legal claim on the poor fund of a parish in Scotland?—I have no idea that any able-bodied person, whether Irish or Scotch, has a legal claim for relief in Scotland.

267. Notwithstanding that decision?—I do not understand that that was the import of that decision.

268. Are you aware of what were the facts of the case which occurred with respect to the Abbey parish in Paisley?—I understood that an application was made in the ordinary course to the heritors of the parish and kirk session, by an Irish pauper, for relief; the relief was refused him; he then went by petition to the sheriff; the sheriff affirmed the proceeding of the heritors and kirk session, and he then removed his case from the court of the sheriff into the Court of Session, and the Court of Session found that the sheriff had no jurisdiction to review the proceeding of the heritors and kirk session.

269. These words have been quoted as forming part of the decision of the Court of Session, in the case of *The Barony Parish v. Higgins*, "That a pauper in Scotland is not a beggar of charity, but a creditor of a fund, of which the kirk session and the heritors are accountable trustees." Would it appear to you, from these words, that that principle was applicable to able-bodied paupers?—No, I see nothing whatever affecting that question, in that decision.

270. Supposing emigration to take place to any extent in the district with which you are acquainted, would not the effect of that emigration, in your opinion, be to raise the price of labour?—I should suppose so.

271. Do you not conceive that a rise in the price of labour would operate to induce an increased influx of people into the district in question?—Unquestionably.

272. From what quarter do you conceive that influx of people would come?—Partly from the neighbouring parts of Scotland, and also from Ireland.

273. Supposing a system of emigration to the colonies to take place from Scotland, at a time when no such system of colonial emigration took place from Ireland, would not the inducement to the Irish to emigrate to Scotland, be greater than it now is?—Undoubtedly.

274. Is not the tendency of the present system, in the district to which your evidence has reference, the substitution of an Irish population for the original Scotch population?—I think it is.

275. Has that of late very much augmented, in consequence of the facility of steam-boat navigation?—It has; the Irish come over, I believe, at from 4d. to 6d. a head.

276. In your part of the country, is the Irish population, of which you speak, a constantly moving population, or is it stationary?—Part of it is stationary; but there is also a great part of it that is constantly coming and going.

277. Do you know whether there is any considerable proportion of that population which resides long enough within the parishes to gain a legal settlement by the law of Scotland?—In my immediate neighbourhood that hardly ever happens; but in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, I believe, it is common.

278. Then the injury which that Irish population does to you, is merely in lowering the rate of wages generally, and thereby throwing the native population upon the legal relief?—That is the way the evil operates, without considering the moral effects.

279. Do not you conceive that one of the great causes of the emigration of the Irish to Scotland, is to be found in the misery and destitution in which they are placed in their own country?—Certainly.

280. Do you not also conceive that any unsettled state of things in that country, which prevents the investment of capital in manufactures, tends to induce the population to go into a country where manufactures can be carried on advantageously?—Yes; and I know, from experience, that after there have been disturbances in Ireland, there is always an influx into Scotland.

281. Are the Irish emigrants, of whom you have spoken, chiefly from the north of Ireland?—Chiefly from the north.

282. Are

282. Are they Catholics or Protestants?—Partly both; I believe there are a great many Catholics in the neighbourhood of Glasgow.

283. Are they chiefly weavers?—They are of all descriptions.

284. Do not you conceive that the introduction of the power-loom and the general application of machinery to manufactures, has had as great an effect in deteriorating the condition of the working classes in Scotland, as the emigration from Ireland; restricting the question of course to the first effect of the introduction of machinery, without referring to its ultimate tendency?—With regard to the price of labour, I should suppose it has; but I do not think myself competent to answer the whole question.

285. Have not you observed that the Irish who have gone into the manufacturing districts of Scotland, have been much more stationary, generally, than the Irish who have gone into the agricultural districts?—I believe that is the case.

286. You have stated that the great body of the population in your part of the country who are desirous to emigrate, are operative weavers?—Entirely.

287. You were also understood to say, that the Petitioners were persons much accustomed to agricultural pursuits?—I said that all of them were more or less accustomed to agricultural pursuits.

288. How do you reconcile those circumstances?—They live in country villages, and each of them has a small piece of land that he cultivates.

289. Are not most of the native hand weavers of Scotland accustomed at times to work in agricultural labour?—Those that I am best acquainted with are those that live in the country villages, I believe they are almost entirely so; but I am not so well acquainted with the dense population of Glasgow.

290. During the hay and corn harvest, do not they almost always work in the field?—They certainly do.

With regard to the poor's rate, I wish to make one observation. What I believe to be the great difference between the Scotch and English systems, with regard to the poor's rate, is this; that in Scotland the kirk session, who correspond to the churchwardens in England that have the distribution of the poor's money, and the heritors who are the landowners of the parish, have a right to determine to what amount relief shall be given to those individuals who are entitled by law to receive it. They have no right to say what description of persons are entitled by law to relief, but they have a right to determine the amount to be given; and there is no jurisdiction in the sheriff or justices of the peace, or any subordinate judge or magistrate of any description, to control the judgment those persons may pronounce with regard to the amount of the relief; but if they refuse altogether relief to a person who is entitled to it by law, that person may have a remedy by submitting the case to review in the Court of Session, which is the supreme court.

Sabbati, 24^a die Februarii, 1827.

Major Thomas Moody, called in; and Examined.

291. YOU have lately been at Manchester?—I have.

292. Have you had an opportunity of inquiring, in detail, into the state of the pauper population in that part?—To a certain extent I have, through the facilities that were given to me by the churchwardens, and by many proprietors of mills.

293. Have you received any statements as to the amount of poor who are either wholly unemployed or only partially employed, and receiving parochial assistance?—Of those who are partially employed, and who are receiving parochial assistance, I got a statement in considerable detail.

294. To what district do your observations apply?—To the township of Manchester.

295. Did you get your information from the churchwardens and the parish officers, both of the township of Manchester and of Salford?—No, in the township of Manchester alone.

296. Will you state to the Committee the details you obtained?—The average number of persons relieved weekly in the township of Manchester consists of about 3,590 families, computed to be 14,680 persons, of whom about 6,728 are males, and about 7,952 females, and of whom about 7,900 are able to work, if employment could be obtained. During the year 1826, the sum distributed to those persons was 40,500*l*. It is necessary to add, that during the latter part of the year, the distress

Major
Thomas Moody.
24 February
1827.

H. H. Drummond,
Esq.

21 February,
1827.

Major
Thomas Nassby.

24 February,
1827.

was greatest, but this statement of annual expense is diffused over the whole period of twelve months. In order to compare it with what had been the amount in the years before, I beg leave to state that in the preceding year, 1825, the sum distributed had only been 25,388*l*.

297. That refers to parochial distribution?—Yes.

298. Among how many persons was it distributed?—About 1,501 families, consisting, upon computation, of about 5,291 persons. In the year 1824, the sum distributed amongst the poor was 21,158*l*; it was distributed among 4,755 persons. In 1823, the sum distributed was only 19,748*l* among 4,709 persons. It is necessary to observe, that there is a great inequality in the number of persons that so received relief, in consequence of the distress falling at particular times; but the sums will always give a correct idea of the measure of distress, better than the number of families.

299. Do you suppose that before 1823 the rates were in their ordinary state?—I suppose that must have been the case for three years, or thereabouts. In 1822, the expenditure for the poor was 20,866*l*.

300. Can you state what is considered, in the district, to have been the ordinary amount of poor rates?—I cannot state that; it would appear from the statement given to me, that the average was about 23,000*l* during the three years preceding the period of my visit.

301. Was the 40,500*l*, which was paid in 1826, exclusively raised in Manchester, or was part of it furnished by the London Committee?—No part of it was furnished by the London Committee, as was stated to me.

302. Have you any opportunity of knowing what contributions were made by the London Committee?—No, I have not.

303. You stated, that in the year 1826, this part of this fund was distributed to 7,900 persons who were able to work, and employment been found for them; can you state what number of persons, so situated, were out of work in former years?—No, I cannot. When I say that they were able to work, if employment had been found for them, I mean that they were partially employed; I do not mean to say that they were out of work from January to December, but they were only partially employed, which led to the necessity of parochial relief being afforded to them at certain periods of the year.

304. Can you state what was the parochial rate per pound on the actual rent in Manchester, in the year 1826?—I have not got that; I have only the total sums.

305. Supposing a man, a woman, and three children, to be unemployed, what is the expense per week at which their subsistence is to be estimated?—A man employed as a weaver, with a wife and three children, should earn in net money, 2*s*. 6*d*. per day, or 15*s*. per week, to enable him to provide for himself and his family without subsistence from the parish rates, supposing his expenses of living to continue at the scale which they were once at, that scale being as follows; house rent, 2*s*. a week; clothes, 2*s*. 6*d*. a week; wheat flour, and oatmeal, 3*s*. 6*d*.; bacon and butcher's meat, 2*s*. 6*d*.; coffee, tea and sugar, 1*s*. 6*d*.; coal and candles, 1*s*.; beer, 1*s*. and sundries, 1*s*.; making 15*s*. per week.

306. Upon what data was that estimate formed?—It was furnished by a master manufacturer to me, of what the wages paid to one of his men were, and the account which the man gave of his expenditure.

307. You state 15*s*. to be the weekly expense of a man, his wife, and three children; at what reduction from that amount would that man call upon the parish for relief?—I suppose if he did not get from ten to twelve shillings, he would then call upon the parish for relief, to make it up to ten or twelve shillings, but not above that; at least I understood that to be the rule.

308. Would a select vestry, sitting in Manchester, give relief in case of a reduction below 12*s*. a week?—Yes, I believe they would, to the extent of from ten to twelve shillings; it would depend upon the means of the family to support themselves, and their appearance. The manner in which I saw the business conducted, was this: certain gentlemen were sitting where the poor appeared personally, and the widemen, or parish officers, gave the poor applicant a ticket for relief, after inquiry made by sending out visitors to ascertain where the man worked, and what his character was.

309. Can you state the quantities of meat and bacon referred to in the estimate you have given?—I cannot, in that instance; but I can in the case of a cotton spinner.

Major
Thomas Moody.
24 February,
1827.

310. Did you see any case of a weaver applying to receive a ticket for relief, whose net earnings amounted to 10s. a week?—No, he was not getting perhaps above 4s. 6d. or 6s. a week, and it was the sum between that 4s. 6d. or 6s. a week and 10s. that he applied for, taking into consideration what his family might earn.

311. You mean, that a weaver in the receipt of five or six shillings a week would be considered by the parish officers as entitled to four or five shillings in addition?—If the particular circumstances of the case justified it, with respect to his family.

312. Do you then state it to the Committee as your belief, that there is no weaver earning only 6s. a week, having a wife and three children, who is not receiving 4s. a week from the parish?—No, I cannot say that; I only speak to what I observed to be the rule.

313. On the other hand, are you not of opinion that there are many weavers who are earning no more than 6s. a week, with a wife and three children, who are not receiving any thing from the parish?—There may be many, who are Irish, and who have not settlements.

314. With respect to the Irish weavers, do they receive parochial relief of any kind?—In case of great distress only.

315. When the rate of wages falls so low that the weaver cannot earn more than four or five shillings a week, how does the Irish weaver manage to support himself, his wife, and his children?—They are reduced to a scale of subsistence equal to their salary. Such a scale as will meet the sum of 7s. 6d. per week may be thus explained, as stated to me: in that case, the house rent will be 1s. 6d.; clothes, 6d.; wheat flour and oatmeal, but a great proportion of it being oatmeal, amounted to 2s.; bacon and butcher's meat, of which the greater part is bacon, 1s.; coffee, tea and sugar, 1s.; coal and candle, 6d.; beer, given up. In the former case, 1s. a week was expended in beer. I beg to observe that my object was to see, in case of distress, what article was particularly diminished in the consumption.

316. Does that rate of subsistence afford sufficient nourishment for a family, to keep them in good health?—It is higher than the rate at which they are supported in the poor house, of which I have got the estimate.

317. Are you now talking of the hand-loom weavers?—I am speaking of hand-loom weaving, combined with machinery, by which, for example, his web is dressed, &c.

318. You have stated, that there were 7,900 persons able to work, either without work or only partially employed; supposing one-half of those persons to be taken away, would there be full employment for the remainder?—Among the hand-loom weavers, who have not the aid of machinery, I do not think wages would rise, or that employment would soon be found.

319. Do you think, supposing two-thirds had been abstracted, that there would have been employment for the remainder?—I could not say with certainty, as my knowledge of the statistics of the town does not comprehend exactly the number employed as hand-loom weavers merely.

320. Can you state what proportion of the subsistence of those persons was supplied by their own partial employment, and what proportion was paid from the parish rates?—No, I cannot.

321. Supposing them to have had no employment at all, an abstraction of the whole number of 7,900 would have left the working population in that district with employment sufficient for their maintenance without coming upon the parish rates?—I should suppose so; but that question involves another one, which would be the demand for their labour from the sale of the articles raised.

322. Can you say what proportion of the 40,500*l.* you have mentioned, was expended upon the 7,900 able-bodied men who were partially employed?—No.

323. Can you tell what proportion of the 7,900 able-bodied men had settlements, and what portion of them were casual poor?—I cannot.

324. Do you conceive that the difficulty of finding employment, which at present prevails, arises to any considerable extent from the introduction of the power-loom into that neighbourhood?—Decidedly it is one cause.

325. Is it a principal cause?—It is, but the want of demand must be an equally powerful cause.

326. Are the Committee to understand that in your opinion the introduction of the power-loom was a principal cause, and that that was very much increased and aggravated by the general want of demand in the trade?—That is the idea I wish to express.

Major
Thomas Mowbray.

24 February,
1837.

327. You are not able to state to the Committee what proportion of the evil you conceive to arise from the introduction of the power-loom?—No, I could not state that with accuracy; I conceive that information could be got from estimating the quantity of work which is done by the power-loom, as compared by the quantity of work done by the hand loom.

328. Can you state in what proportion the introduction of the power-loom reduces the number of hands employed?—No, I could not state the exact proportion, but it is considerable.

329. How long has this intense distress prevailed in that neighbourhood?—I should suppose within six months may be the period of the greatest intensity of the distress. It was considered to be wearing away when I was there.

330. Did it begin only six months ago?—I could not speak to that; from the paper given to me it appeared that the distress was more in the latter period of the year; and dividing the year into periods of six months, I suppose the six last months was the period in which the distress was most intense.

331. But it was wearing away when you left?—It was, they having removed a great number of the people so causing the distress.

332. How did they remove them?—By paying them money to go to their parishes.

333. To what extent was that done?—In 1826 the number of individuals removed was 4,029, in 1825 the number of individuals removed was 698, in 1824 it was 610; and it appears that in the year 1818 there had been a period of distress, and during that year 1,177 were removed, still it was very far short of the distress in 1826, as diffused over the whole year.

334. Can you state in what proportion there was an influx of population into those districts in the preceding year?—No, I cannot.

335. The year before this great distress, were not the manufactures in that district in a state of great prosperity?—Very great; by prosperity, I mean that there was a great demand for labour.

336. Was there not a great influx of population into the district, from the surrounding country?—I am not aware whether the prosperity arose by augmentation of wages, in consequence of a demand for goods, or by the increase of labourers being less than the demand for labour. I am not informed as to the influx of population from the country.

337. Were there not a great many new factories built?—Not many actually filled with machinery, as I was told; but not being resident in Manchester, I cannot speak positively, as I am not a resident in Manchester.

338. The question refers to the two years preceding the commencement of the distress?—I understood there were not many built and filled with machinery; two or three might have been laid out, and built, or perhaps more; I cannot speak positively, as I am not a resident in Manchester.

339. But the trade was considered to be in full employment?—It was, in those years preceding the distress; it was considered that there was full employment for every body.

340. Is not it now considered that there was at that period a good deal of what is called over-trading?—The opinion is, that they had over calculated the demand in the market for their goods.

341. Having lately visited Lancashire, with the view of inquiring into the causes of the present distress there, did you ask any questions relative to the increased facility of communication with Ireland?—Yes; but my object in visiting Lancashire was not entirely that stated in the question.

342. What is the present cost of a passage between Dublin and Liverpool?—I did not ask the question as to the exact price; but I understood it was a very low sum.

343. Considering the facility of that communication, and the fact, which is notorious, of there being a surplus population in Ireland, have you any doubt, if a portion of the present distressed weavers were removed from Manchester, and wages rose either from an increase of demand for the manufactures or a diminished supply of labour, that an immediate influx of Irish hands would take place?—I think it is extremely probable.

344. Have you any doubt it would be the case?—None whatever.

345. Would those persons, so introduced, have a legal claim upon the poor rates of Manchester?—No, I apprehend, not to the same extent as parish poor.

346. Therefore the charge upon the poor rates would not be increased in consequence of such introduction?—Certainly not to any very great extent.

347. If

Mayor
Thomas Moody.
24 February,
1827.

347. If those persons were utterly destitute, would they not be entitled to relief as casual poor, and must they not be removed at the expense of the parish?—It would be a matter of individual benevolence so far as efficient relief would be applied to them; the removal of them by the parish would be a matter of necessity, as I apprehend.

348. Are you able to inform the Committee at what expense the Irish paupers were removed?—They gave them 6s. 3d. each. In answer to this question, which I put to the churchwardens, "How many of those persons so removed were Irish or Scotch, and what has been the expense of removing each during the year 1826," I was told that there were about 3,660 all Irish; the expense of removing each person of this class averages 6s. 3d.

349. You have stated that 4,029 individuals were removed in 1826; do you know what effect the removal of those persons had upon the price of labour to the remainder?—I believe there was little or no change in the price, in consequence of the diminished demand for labour.

350. Have you any information with regard to the price of a passage on the deck of a steam-boat, from Dublin to Liverpool?—I have not, from any inquiries of my own.

351. Does it amount to 1s. 6d.?—I believe it is as small a sum as that, when they lay in their own bag of potatoes or subsistence for the passage.

352. When money was furnished to send them away from Manchester, do you know where they were sent to?—I do not; I suppose they went to Ireland, or to wherever there was likely to be a demand for their labour in England.

353. Do you know whether they were relieved at all before being sent away?—Yes, that 6s. 3d. contributed to relieve them.

354. Did not you find, upon inquiry in Manchester, that in the year or two preceding 1826, considerable factories were established, particularly weaving factories and silk factories?—No, I did not inquire much into this circumstance.

355. You have stated that one principal cause of the deterioration of the wages of labour, has been the introduction of machinery; are you of opinion that in the event of any number of unemployed persons being abstracted from Manchester and its neighbourhood, by emigration, and the recurrence of a demand for labour beyond the rate of demand at the period of their removal, that the increase of the wages of labour which might be expected to result from such a state of things would be lessened by the actual introduction of more machinery than is now employed?—Yes, I think it would.

356. Are you of opinion that in point of fact, machinery is at this moment withheld, in consequence of the low price of labour and the destitute condition of the labouring artisans?—It would be difficult to say that it is withheld; some persons may do so, but others say they never deferred for one moment any improvement that they could make in their machinery, the desire of competing with others induced them instantly to use it; but as a general opinion, I would say, that if wages were high, the principle of competition would naturally lead them to introduce machinery to enable them to raise the article at a low expense, and that machinery would naturally throw out human labour, unless the demand were favourable to its employment by an increased demand.

357. Have you had any communication upon the subject with any persons who are manufacturers of machinery?—Yes.

358. What was their opinion upon that point?—Their opinion was, that machinery would be increased, to the substitution of human labour.

359. Have you any means of forming an idea of the average rate of wages of the hand weavers who are fully employed?—With respect to weavers on the common hand loom, when weaving is performed in the cottage of the labourer, the earnings for any description of plain work will be far short of those quoted in the factory arrangement on the improved loom, because much of the weaver's time is taken up in dressing his warp; he has also to find material for dressing. Therefore, say a Bolton 60 reed calico 6-4 wide, a man working 12 to 14 hours a day will weave 24 yards per week, at 3½d. per yard, being 7s.; deduct now for dressing, winding his walt, shuttles, &c. 2s. 6d. to 3s. per week, leaving the net money to the weaver, 4s. to 4s. 6d. per week. In Blackburn and the neighbourhood, the work is chiefly of coarse and light quality of cloth; the net earnings of the workman will be about the sum of 4s. to 4s. 6d. or 5s. per week. In the factory arrangement, every thing is found for the weaver, his warps are dressed by ma-

*Mr.
Thomas Moody.*

24 February,
1867.

chinery, and every preparation the same as for power-weaving; he has nothing to take off his attention, but continues at the loom; on this system, with the low price of labour, the hand weaving is nearly if not fully equal to the power, in certain fabrics.

360. Do not the low prices of hand weaving, as compared with the high prices of power-loom weaving, bring the hand weaver to an equality with the power-loom weaver?—Yes, as I understood in some kinds of work, where the weaver had assistance from machinery in the manufactory.

361. Can you state what the average wages gained by a power-loom weaver, upon the articles you have just enumerated, amounted to?—The case that was given to me was one in which were combined, partly power machinery and partly the dandy loom. The amount of wages gained by persons employed in this combined manufactory were given to me in this scale. The whistlers, young or married women, 18 to 25 years of age, 8s. to 10s. per week; if younger, say 12 to 16 years old, 5s. to 7s. Warpers, young or married women, 18 to 25 years of age, 10s. to 12s. per week. Warp dressers, men from 25 to 40 years of age and upwards, ordinary or coarse work, 20s. to 25s. per week; fine work, (that is, when fine yarn is used) 30s. to 40s. per week. With respect to weavers on power-loom:—power-loomers are tended by young men or women, one person attending two looms; the average weekly earnings will be from 7s. 6d. to 10s. 6d. for persons of 14 to 22 years of age; fine work will average higher, say 10s. 6d. to 14s. per week; if the hands are younger, the earnings will be less in proportion. Weavers on the improved broad loom:—A man, working 12 to 14 hours a day, will weave of coarse cloth per week 144 yards, at 1d. per yard, 9s. a week; a woman, 108 yards, 6s. 9d. per week; a boy or girl, 90 yards, 4s. 6d. to 5s. 8d. per week. Middling quality, a man will weave (working as above) 60 yards per week, at 1d. per yard, 8s. 9d.; a woman 48 yards, 7s. Fine quality (say a Bolton 60 reed 6-4 wide) a man will weave 48 yards per week, at 2d. per yard, 10s. per week; a woman 36 yards per week, at 2d., 7s. 6d. per week.

362. Is not the improvement of the power-loom still progressive?—From the effect of science being applied to the mechanical power, I should say it must be progressive.

363. Is not almost every species of work wrought by the power-loom, of a better texture and fabric than that wrought by the hand?—It is considered more equal; but it is in some measure a disputed point as to fineness; a gentleman who uses some proportion of hand-loom weaving, with the aid of machinery to dress, &c., thinks that he makes a better quality of fine cloth by that means than he could by machinery alone.

364. The quality of the article being so nearly the same, and the cost of the manufactory being so much less by the power-loom than by the hand loom, is it your opinion that hand-loom weaving must very soon cease in this country?—I think it is a fair inference, that mere cottage hand-loom weaving must give way to the cheaper manufactory by machinery.

365. And that speedily?—I could not say speedily, because, where wages are very low, I saw a manufactory where one kind of hand-loom weaving was adopted in preference to machinery alone.

366. Are you aware of the tax existing on common prints?—Yes.

367. That tax is levied when a plain web goes to the printfield?—Yes, I believe it is.

368. The only work which the power-loom cannot now produce equally with the hand loom, is a variegated pattern?—Yes, there is a difficulty in that.

369. Can you state at what rate of wages you suppose a hand-loom weaver could successfully enter into competition with a power-loom weaver?—I could not, but I think he could not possibly compete with him finally.

370. At no rate of wages; not even at 5s. or 6s. a week?—That would be such a deterioration of his condition that I could scarcely suppose an English labourer to compete under those circumstances; he would have to give up his clothing, and diminish his subsistence.

371. You stated one case, where you knew of a manufacturer that employed a great number of hand-loom weavers, although he had the means of instituting machinery?—That is to say, part of the manufactory consisted of machinery, and part of it of hand-loom weaving; but it was not what is called the cottage system, it was hand-loom weaving in a manufactory, where the dressing and preparation of the web was done by machinery, and the weaver had nothing to do but to sit down and drive his shuttle; there he wove a better kind of cloth, and got somewhat higher

higher wages than the mere cottage hand-loom weaver, who had to dress his own web, &c.

372. Did that individual continue that kind of hand-loom system in consequence of the cheapness of labour?—Yes, he told me so.

373. You mentioned calicoes that were wove at the rate of three farthings a yard; at what rate could the same description of calico be wove by the power-loom?—I cannot state that; but I suppose not much cheaper.

374. Did you go yourself into any of the power-loom factories?—No, I did not in Manchester.

375. Did you learn from inquiries that the rate of wages paid was generally in proportion to the number of power-looms that each individual attended?—Yes, I understood that.

376. And that some attended one loom, some two, and some three?—I did not know that they went so far as three.

377. You have stated that a weaver, according to the cottage system, earned, till the last year, from four shillings to five shillings a week; do you happen to know how much he earned in 1825, when you have stated that there was a great demand for labour?—No, I do not exactly; but I understood during the last ten years, that wages had changed from 10*s.* to 20*s.*, making an average of 15*s.* per week.

378. Did there seem to you to be a very strong wish on the part of the distressed inhabitants of Manchester, to emigrate?—It was a question I never asked any one of them; I was desirous of exciting no feeling upon that or any other subject; I was there as a private individual.

379. You have been in different parts of America, have you not?—I have.

380. Do you consider that the surplus population of our manufacturing towns are calculated to make good settlers in the back woods of America?—I have never had any experience upon that subject, from what I have seen in the Report of the Emigration Committee, it would appear that a person that had been a cottage hand-loom weaver could very soon obtain the knowledge necessary to cultivate the ground, where the fertility of the soil is such that it requires nothing but an axe to cut down the trees, and a hoe to put in the seed.

381. Are you not aware that to wield the axe requires a very powerful arm?—Yes.

382. Do you think that the habits of a manufacturer are calculated to give him sufficient strength for the labours of the field, in a new country?—Not equal to the back-woodsman, for a constant occupation; but his occupation in felling trees would be very limited, because he would soon be able to fell as much as he wanted, and the ground so cleared of the timber would be able to sustain him; and therefore the talent for felling trees would not be much required of him, as he would not pursue the felling of trees, except for the purpose of clearing the ground he himself intended to cultivate.

383. In a new settlement would not each settler be obliged to fell the trees upon his lot?—Certainly.

384. Must he not, then, have strength sufficient for that purpose?—Certainly he must have strength, but it does not appear to me to require so very great an effort of strength; it appears to me that it may be managed a great deal by address; for instance, by cutting trees in a certain manner, and pulling down one, it sends down many others with it; that address, and others of a like kind, would soon be acquired by an European; but he certainly would not be so dexterous at it as the back-woodsman of America.

385. But you do not consider him incapable of performing the labour necessary in a new settlement?—Most certainly not.

386. Would not the natural course be, that upon emigrants arriving, the previous settlers would assist them in cutting down the trees upon their land, while the emigrants lent their labour to other purposes, to which they were more suited?—There certainly might be some subdivision of labour admitting of that arrangement.

387. Are you acquainted with the emigrations of Irish or English that arrive in America without any capital; and are you able to inform the Committee, from your own knowledge, of the general circumstances that attend the parties so arriving?—I could not speak with great knowledge of the details, but I can state what I observed when in the city of New York. I found that most of the coachmen and carmen, and that class of people, were Irish; such occupations gave employment to a great number; but if you were to send four or five thousand more, great distress would arise in the city of New York, from those people not being able to get employment. In the city of New York, there are various societies under the name of

Major
Thomas Moody.

24 February,
1827.

Societies for the Refuge of the Destitute, and for the prevention of pauperism, &c.; such charitable societies have for their object to relieve foreigners in distress. I think it was in an American paper of last September, in the *Albany Advertiser*, that there was a complaint of New York sending up Irish emigrants in the steam-boats from New York; in order to get rid of them, they sent them up to Albany, and the people in Albany not having employment for them at that season of the year, felt it a very great inconvenience, and they spoke of it as a matter of complaint that the people of New York should send that class of people to them.

388. Do you think yourself authorized, from the information you have obtained, in giving an opinion as to the effect of a desultory emigration of unprovided Scotch or English emigrants into different parts of the United States?—I should say it would be very injurious to the individuals; a few hundred, or perhaps a few thousand people might be absorbed, and might find their way finally perhaps among the farmers in the back settlements; but if sent in very great numbers before they got there, they would suffer a great deal of misery.

389. Are you aware that in the years 1822 and 1823, prior to the passing of the Passenger's Act, the voluntary emigrants from Ireland averaged 10,300 annually?—I dare say they did, but not all to the United States.

390. Were not those voluntary emigrants absorbed by the demand for labour in the United States?—Many of them would be, but a great many of them suffered very much, and afterwards went to our own provinces in Canada; there was about that period a great demand for labour in cutting the canal from Lake Erie to Albany, which absorbed those people; but that work being finished, you cannot calculate upon the same employment in other years as there was in those years.

391. Is there not a great canal now cutting, at the expense of the American government?—The great canal that I know, is now finished.

392. Is there not a canal now contemplated by the American government, between the Ohio and lake Erie?—I have heard that there is, but I do not know that it is begun.

393. Are you aware of the fact, that upon the passing of the Passenger's Act in 1824, in the following year the average number of voluntary emigrants from Ireland diminished from 10,300 to 7,500?—It might be so, but I could not connect the mere co-existence of the passing of that Act and the diminishing of the number of emigrants, so far as the United States are concerned, because there might have been a less demand for labour.

394. Do you know the price of labour in the United States?—It is high, varying from half a dollar to a dollar a day.

395. In proportion as the United States become more densely peopled in the parts adjoining the Atlantic, will there not be a greater difficulty attaching to those emigrants, inasmuch as expense must be incurred by them, before they can arrive at the ground where a real demand may exist for their labour?—So much so, that great expense is incurred by the Americans themselves that go from New England to the new states, and they cannot go there without they have money; still more must it be difficult for an Irish emigrant to go there, and therefore they must be exposed to great difficulty if landed in the seaports there in great numbers; when they are in small numbers, the evil does not exist so much.

396. With respect to those 10,000, to which reference has been made, is it not the fact that a great number of them have gone to the Canadas?—A great number, no doubt; a great number of them got work in the United States, in making those canals, and in making roads, and with the money they obtained in that way, they settled themselves in Canada.

397. Do you happen to know, that although there may be an over-supply of labourers at times in some parts of the United States, in point of fact, that over-supply very soon becomes absorbed by the demand from the interior for labour?—When the demand is good for their productions, of course the labour of emigrants is sooner absorbed; but that demand has not been so great of late years as it was in former years, with reference to the population of the United States who work.

398. Do you know, as a matter of fact, whether in any part of the United States there has been an over-supply of labour in the last year?—I cannot speak positively as to the last year, because I have not been there.

399. Or in the previous year?—Nor in the previous year.

400. Have you known cases of distress occurring in the United States, similar to those that have taken place in England?—Not to so great an extent; but individual cases of distress I have known. In going through the prisons at New York

York with Mr. Delbit Clinton, who is now the governor, in consequence of a particular inquiry to which I had directed my attention at that time, I wished to know the number of prisoners, their crimes, and the countries of which they were natives; and the greatest number of European criminals were Irish. The negroes, in proportion to the population, were, as criminals, more numerous than the whites.

401. Do you know whether the state of the Irish who are in the United States is not the most miserable, and whether they are not the most wretched part of the population?—Decidedly so, except the free black population in New York, according to the statements of Americans.

402. Have you ever heard of distress existing in any part of the manufacturing districts of the United States, similar to that which has pervaded the manufacturing districts in England?—I have not.

403. Is the manufacture of cotton increasing in the United States?—Yes, particularly of the lower quality of goods.

404. Is there a demand for hand-loom weavers there?—I should suppose there is, to a certain extent.

405. Are there any power-looms there?—Yes.

406. Would there be a demand for power-loom weavers there?—Certainly.

407. Have you any means of comparing the rate of wages obtained by weavers in this country, with the rate of wages obtained in the United States?—No, I have not; so as to speak with accuracy.

408. Would not it be as expensive for an inhabitant of the New England States to transport himself to the Ohio, where the new lands are settling, as to transport a person from England or from Ireland to Upper Canada?—I think it would be much more expensive for an American emigrant, from Massachusetts, to remove himself to the Ohio, than for an Irishman to be landed in Upper Canada; it would be cheaper to get to the Ohio from Dublin, by the Saint Lawrence and Upper Canada, than it would be to go by any port of the United States sea ports.

409. Are you aware that the State of New York, and most of the New England States, have a law which prohibits passengers to be landed in their states without security being given by the captain, that they shall not come upon the parish?—Yes, there is; that they shall not be chargeable, I think, for a year and a day in New York.

410. Do you know if there is any preference given in the United States to any particular class of British subjects, more than to others?—I think there is a partiality shown to the Scotch generally, by those to whom I spoke.

Martis, 27^e die Februarii, 1827.

The Rev. John Matthias Turner, called in; and Examined.

411. YOU are the rector of Wilmslowe, in Cheshire?—I am.

412. That parish is within twelve miles of Manchester?—It is.

413. Is it a populous parish?—It contains about 4,000 inhabitants.

414. Are the poor rates high?—They have been very low, but we have doubled them within the last year.

415. What is the principal cause to which you attribute the increase of the poor rates?—The want of employment in both branches of manufacture; the weaving, which is our staple manufacture, and the cotton spinning, which employs a portion of our population.

416. Do you make any distinction between those two branches; is the one suffering more than the other?—I think the weaver has suffered more uniformly.

417. Can you supply the Committee with any details respecting the increase of parochial expense in the last two years?—Broadly I should state, that our poor rates, which were in a very wholesome state in the beginning of the year, not amounting to more than half-a-crown in the pound, have become five shillings upon the rack-rent.

418. Are there in your parish any paupers whom you consider as entirely unemployed?—The spinners have been entirely unemployed, and the weavers for about six weeks of the year were totally without employment.

419. What is the mode pursued with respect to the unemployed persons?—In the months of May and June we obtained assistance from the London Committee, and administered relief in the first instance by the direct supply of their wants, afterwards as a reward for labour. I should state to the Committee, that although in amount our poor rates are very low, compared with the agricultural districts, yet we

Major
Thomas Moody,

24 February,
1827.

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1827.

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1847.

we are acting upon a principle which must of necessity extend our poor rates; and as we have doubled in one year, I see no hindrance in the way of our doubling in another year, or even within a shorter period.

420. What principle do you allude to as the principle now acted upon?—The principle of making up the deficiency, or the alleged deficiency of wages, out of the poor rates.

421. Are you of opinion that the poor rates of that parish would be materially relieved by the removal of any of those parties, provided they emigrated with their own consent?—It would enable us to offer to the weavers, who are now more particularly the objects of our solicitude, means of support; they come to us now, desiring to have the deficiency of their wages made up, and we are obliged to comply with the request, because we know that the wages are insufficient, and we have no means of giving them employment; I look to a well regulated system of Emigration as likely to supply us with those means which we feel daily the want of.

422. In what sense do you consider it to supply those means?—I should imagine that upon a weaver applying for our assistance to make out his wages, if, instead of giving him the small sum he appears to require, we were able to say, We can find you a mode of occupation by which your family will be supported, that that would be a sufficient answer to him. If the select vestry saw that they should relieve themselves from the burthen of a family, of which burthen they can never calculate the extent, because probably the families will become permanently chargeable, they would be satisfied to make such exertion.

423. You will understand that the questions that are asked upon this subject, with respect to your parish, are put upon the supposition that an Act of Parliament were passed, relieving the parish permanently from the party who may be assisted to emigrate?—With that understanding, I should say that a very considerable pecuniary exertion would be made on the part of the parish.

424. What is the average extent of assistance which at the present moment is given to weavers whose wages are not sufficient to support their families, and on what principle is that relief given?—There is an understanding, and I may say the principle is recognised, that half-a-crown a head for a family is necessary for their support, consequently a family of six persons should be receiving 15s. a week; if they do not receive 15s. a week for their wages as weavers, they consider that that sum should be made up to them out of the poor rates; this is virtually the principle acted on, and I believe not only in our parish, but in many of the large townships near Manchester.

425. Is that the principle on which relief is generally administered in that parish?—It is the principle which has been recently acted on, and is virtually the principle by which all the committees are guided.

426. How long has the hand-loom weaving been introduced in your parish?—I cannot speak with great certainty, but, I should think, for thirty years it has been the standard occupation of our people, and it has been an occupation in which they have engaged without any limitation but the size of their families, for they had as much work as the looms they set up would enable them to furnish.

427. Has not the invention of the power-loom superseded the use of those hand looms?—Undoubtedly, it would have superseded them much more rapidly than it has done, if the hand-loom weaver were not enabled to submit to a reduction of wages, for the reasons I have stated.

428. But in so submitting, he has accepted wages which are insufficient to support him, and he looks to parochial contribution for the remainder of his support?—Yes; and, in fact, the competition between the hand loom and the power-loom is maintained out of the poor rates.

429. With reference to all these circumstances combined, are you of opinion that the subtraction of a certain number of families from the parish altogether would be attended with an economy, which would induce the parish, under certain circumstances, to contribute to their removal?—I am of that opinion.

430. For example, you have stated that every family, admitting that they were out of employment during the whole year, could not be estimated at less than half-a-crown per head; consequently a family, of a man, a woman, and three children, must be estimated at 12s. 6d. per week, which would amount to 32l. 10s. per ann. supposing the family to be exclusively supported by the parish during that period; are you of opinion that the parish would consent to charge their rates with an annuity of 6l. 10s. per annum for ten years, supposing an Act of Parliament were passed, giving the power of making such an arrangement, upon which annuity they could raise

raise the sum of 50*l.* to be advanced for the purpose of emigration of each family; it being understood that the weaver, from a full knowledge of the new circumstances in which he was to be placed upon his emigration, was desirous of taking advantage of it?—I am induced to form a very strong opinion that the parish would come forward liberally, because I happen to know that in a case where the emigration was only the moving to Scotland with certain silk machinery, it was considered an excellent bargain, though a sum a little short of 20*l.* was laid down to get rid of a family of, I believe, five persons, and with a daily liability to their return.

431. Are you of opinion that in such case the parish would prefer to charge their poor rates for ten years with an annuity of 6*l.* 10*s.* rather than raise the 50*l.* at once?—Certainly, I think so; but a provision must be made to enable them to do so. Every one that is conversant with the management of parochial business, knows that they would prefer the system of annuity to any present effort.

432. You think, therefore, if their minds were satisfied that the weaver would receive advantages, with respect to his emigration, sufficient to place him in a situation of independence and comfort, that they would not hesitate to charge their rates with a sum to that amount, which would of course involve the certainty of their being obliged to pay that sum for the period of ten years; whereas if trade were to revive very extensively, those parties might not be chargeable upon the poor rates for such a period?—My opinion is, that they would be disposed to act upon the principle now laid down, within certain limits; I do not think they would be ready to send off all their applicants, but that for such a proportion of them as would not cause a very striking and alarming difference in the immediate amount of poor rate, they would gladly avail themselves of it.

433. Do you suppose that in any instance a family of five persons receiving partial assistance through the year, does not entail upon the parish greater expense than 6*l.* 10*s.*?—I should conceive that, averaging the families, they would entail as great an expense as that; but I imagine the mode in which the question would be put amongst us, would be prospectively; our case now is, that we are obliged to make out the deficiency of the hand-loom weavers wages, and that will be an increasing deficiency, because of course the master weaver finding that the hand-loom weaver is ready to submit to a reduction of wages, will carry on that reduction; there is no reason why it should stop at seven shillings a week, there is no assignable limit to the reduction, because I conceive that the principle being established, that the deficiency, be it what it may, shall be made up out of the poor rate, we have nothing to look to as a barrier to the extension of it.

434. Has any doubt ever arisen, whether the making up their deficiency is authorized by any existing law?—The doubt has frequently been started, but the cases are commonly of such utter destitution, an appeal is made to the feelings of the select vestries, which is seldom or never rejected.

435. If the deficiency is made up in that way, is it not your opinion that the wages will be forced down by that very operation?—Clearly, I think its necessary effect must be that; I would hardly use so strong a word as that of forcing the wages down, but I think that the matter is put in train, so that the wages will be of necessity reduced, because there is no barrier against such a reduction.

436. Have you not heard that that has been the precise operation in various parts of the county of Lancaster?—I have.

437. Do you imagine that the effect of removing a certain limited number of families by emigration, would be to diminish the extent of assistance given by the parish in aid of the wages to the remaining hand-loom weavers?—I conceive that the relief would be effected in this manner, viz. that the industry of the hand-loom weaver must of necessity be transferred into some other channel, who has lost his occupation through the introduction of the power-loom.

438. Is it understood that there are particular processes of hand-loom weaving which as yet it has not been found practicable to imitate with the power-loom?—I am quite aware that such is the case; but I am of opinion that as great difficulties have been surmounted in the application of power-loom weaving, that those which yet remain will be, by the ingenuity which is now devoted to the subject, in a short time surmounted also, and that the whole business of weaving will be carried on by the power-loom exclusively. The benefit that I should expect from emigration would be, that it would enable the hand-loom weaver to transfer his industry into a new channel, which channel it is the object of this Committee, I understand, to provide.

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1837.

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1867.

439. In the peculiar circumstances of the parish of Wilmslowe, what benefit do you expect will accrue to the parishioners, from the abstraction of a certain number of families by emigration, in diminution of the present poor rates?—I conceive that if in the first instance the outlay be smaller, which according to the calculations which have been stated will be the case, the gain will be the difference between that outlay and the cost of such a family in the anticipated case of their being chargeable for the whole year.

440. Would not the removal of one pauper family tend to facilitate the introduction of another?—I have no apprehension that it would.

441. Do you not imagine that a sense of interest on the part of the select vestry would induce them to place every impediment that the law permitted them in the way of the introduction of fresh persons?—Undoubtedly, I think so; but we should get rid of a family which has a legal settlement, and those that come amongst us would have no settlement, and we should know how to deal with them.

442. Have you any Irish among you?—Very few that become permanent with us, they come in the harvest.

443. You stated your parish to consist of about 4,000 persons; can you give the Committee any idea what proportion of those are hand-loom weavers?—Directly and indirectly engaged in the hand-loom weaving, four-fifths; I think I am not overstating it, because it has become so entirely our domestic manufacture there is scarcely any cottage without its loom, and in some there are two or three.

444. How many persons are there to each family, upon an average?—The average of five to a family is as accurate as possible.

445. Can you state also what proportion of the parish rates, during the last year, has been laid out upon hand-loom weavers out of employment?—I am not prepared to state definitely, but the proportion has been very considerable, because the payment has been not only for subsistence, but very largely to the payment of rent.

446. From what class of proprietors are those houses generally rented?—I think that the proprietors are, for the most part, members of the select vestry.

447. Do you imagine that there would be any objection on the part of the proprietors of those houses, who receive their rents through the medium of the parish rates from those weavers who are unable to pay their rents themselves, to the removal of any of those persons by emigration?—I conceive that if they saw or suspected that it interfered with their immediate interests, there might be an objection.

448. Do you know the number of cottages for which rent is paid by the parish?—No; but I can state, that at a single meeting of the select vestry of the township in which I live, there were applications for rent amounting to 60*l*.

449. What is the general rate per cottage?—The effect of this system of paying the rent out of the poor rates is to keep up the rent of the cottages.

450. You have stated that the parish assist in paying the weekly wages; is not the pauper enabled with that assistance to pay his rent?—In the last year, assistance of both kinds has been given to many families, both in weekly allowance and in rent.

451. Can you state the general amount of rent per cottage?—I should think a cottage, with standing for three looms, which is considered highly desirable, will let for about 7*l*. or 8*l*. a year.

452. Is that entered in the poor rate account as rent?—It had been frequently, but I think in the last year it has been merely entered as money advanced; there was an understanding that it was in the contemplation of the magistrates of the neighbourhood to disallow it.

453. Is there any law which sanctions the payment of cottage rent out of the poor rate?—I conceive not.

454. Is not the effect of paying the cottage rents out of the poor rate, to keep the rents of the cottages in the parish higher than they otherwise would be?—Certainly.

455. Are not persons, from the security that the payment of the cottage rents out of the poor rates gives them of recovering the rent, induced to build cottages, who would not embark their capital in that sort of speculation if they were not secured by the payment of the rents out of the rates?—I am not aware of any instances so which cottages have been built with reference to that security.

456. Has the number of cottages increased in your parish within the last two years?—Not remarkably.

457. But

457. But still, notwithstanding this state of society you have described, they are rather increasing than diminishing?—Yes.

458. However redundant the supply of labour may be in the parish in which you live, you probably are aware that it is still more redundant in Ireland?—I conceive so.

459. You are aware of the facilities of communication between Dublin and Liverpool?—Perfectly.

460. Can you tell the Committee how much a passage on the deck of a steam-vessel between Dublin and Liverpool now costs?—It has been stated to me to be as low as sixpence.

461. Would not the effect of withdrawing a considerable number of the inhabitants of that parish be, in your opinion, to produce a rise of wages?—Not with regard to the hand-loom weaving.

462. With respect to the general rate of wages of labour, if a number of persons now residing in that parish were withdrawn, would not the rate of wages rise?—I should conceive that nothing can affect the rate of wages for hand-loom weaving, for the causes I have stated to the Committee; I anticipate, under no circumstances, a rise in the rate of wages in the hand-loom weaving, the power-loom being supposed to continue its operation; I conceive the rate of wages to depend upon the competition between the hand loom and the power-loom, and not upon the number of persons engaged in the hand-loom weaving.

463. Do you know the rate of wages of the hand-loom weaver, in the last year?—An industrious man could earn nine shillings a week, out of which he pays about two shillings for expenses.

464. Do you know how much he earned in the preceding year?—I cannot state specifically, but I can state a fact which I think bears upon the subject, that it was considered that a family could well maintain themselves on two looms, in the year preceding the last, but in the last year no family was considered to be capable of maintaining themselves with fewer than three looms; therefore I conceive the difference in the wages must be in the proportion of three to two.

465. You are therefore of opinion that whatever may be the state of the prosperity of the trade in this country, the hand-loom weaver at no period can obtain higher wages for his labour than he does at the present time?—My opinion is clearly that he cannot, but I would submit it with great deference, because my knowledge is the result merely of the observation of a clergyman resident in his parish, and arises from no knowledge of the actual state of the manufacture.

466. Have the payments from the poor rates increased in your parish within the last year?—They have increased in the proportion of two to one.

467. Has not that arisen from the greater state of distress of the hand-loom manufacturers?—It has mainly; we had a suspension of the occupation of spinning for about two months in the summer, which was very burdensome.

468. May it not therefore be inferred that the situation of the hand-loom weavers was worse in the last year in consequence of their obtaining less wages, than it was in the preceding year?—That is my opinion.

469. Did not that less amount of wages arise from the more general use of the power-loom?—I can attribute it to no other cause.

470. In your parish are the people employed to hand-loom weaving exclusively, weaving plain calicoes, or what are called fancy goods?—They weave silk, and there is a considerable proportion of fancy goods.

471. Do they not get better wages for that than for the other?—I believe that a very skilful weaver of fancy goods obtains better wages.

472. Much better?—I imagine considerably better.

473. Of the 800 families in your parish, how many have settlements in it?—I am unable to say, but I should conceive the proportion of those that have not settlements is very small.

474. Have you many Irish who have gained settlements?—There is a large cotton factory in the parish which takes apprentices, of whom some are Irish, and they by that means obtain a settlement by serving an apprenticeship of seven years; but I am not aware of any Irish obtaining settlements in the usual mode by renting tenements.

475. If wages rose from any cause whatever in your parish, would not there be an influx of Irish hands brought in by the master manufacturers, for the purpose of reducing the wages?—With regard to the cotton trade, certainly.

476. The master of that factory to which you have alluded, who now has some apprentices,

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1837.

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1827.

apprentices, if the rate of wages rose in that parish would, of course, endeavour to increase the number of his apprentices?—I should conceive it would be his policy to do so.

477. Who would, at the expiration of their apprenticeships, all acquire settlements?—Yes.

478. Can you state in what way the greater number of paupers in your parish have acquired settlements?—By birth, principally.

479. Have any large proportion of them acquired them by serving apprenticeship?—The next class, in point of number, certainly by apprenticeship, for the reason I have stated, that there is a very large cotton factory, which seldom receives fewer than ninety apprentices.

480. You were understood to say that 4,000 is the total number of persons in that parish, of all descriptions?—The census of 1821 made it a few below 4,000, but the increase of the population has been certainly such as to make it exceed 4,000 persons, at present, perhaps, not amounting to 4,200.

481. Of those 800 families, how many are chargeable to the poor rate?—Up to the beginning of the last year the proportion that was chargeable to the poor rates was very small, but in the course of last year I conceive that the number has been trebled; the Committee are aware that I cannot speak to that with precision, as the accounts are not made up till Easter. I should conceive that the actual pensioners have not been very considerably increased; but of the persons that receive what is called casual relief, that is, relief in the shape of rent or assistance in any way, the number cannot have been less than treble in the course of the year.

482. Of the 800 families, how many do you believe have received, in one form or other, and at one time or other, relief, within the course of last year?—I should conceive that one-fifth of the whole population may have received relief.

483. Do you mean not above 130 families?—About that.

484. Do any families receive relief, who have not a legal settlement in the parish?—I think the cases of such relief are very few; I imagine that they last only so long as till the overseer is able to get points settled that are under discussion, if it is a point under discussion.

485. Can you say whether the rent of cottages, which you say is paid out of the poor rates, is ever paid for persons that have not a legal settlement?—I should think, never.

486. Of the total number of families that receive relief, what number do you think receive it permanently?—I am not prepared to give a specific answer; with regard to the present year, we have had a great many who have received relief continuously.

487. How long have they received relief?—It was in the beginning of May that the distress began to be felt heavily with us, and though the means of employment returned partially in June, and almost wholly in July, the habit had been established with many of them, and we have not got rid of them.

488. Can you state, with regard to the time you have mentioned since May, what number have received relief continuously?—Our parish is divided into four townships, and the townships are managed with very different degrees of attention; consequently, the same answer will not apply to each township.

489. The townships are managed separately?—They are.

490. Are they all managed by select vestries?—Three out of the four are.

491. Are they appointed by a local Act, or under the general Select Vestry Act?—Under the general Select Vestry Act.

492. How is the fourth township managed?—It is a very small township, and it is managed by the overseers, without the assistance of a select vestry.

493. Of how many do the select vestries consist?—I believe, in all cases, of the statutable number, 16 or 18.

494. Are there any appeals from the decisions of the vestry?—Appeals are rare.

495. Have they occurred?—They have; I should rather call them complaints than appeals; complaints have been brought before magistrates, and a great degree of attention has been given to them, and they have been settled without any reference to the quarter sessions.

496. Have the magistrates shown a disposition to overrule the decisions of the select vestries?—I think the magistrates are very desirous to concur with the select vestries.

497. Are the cottages rated to the poor rates?—They are.

498. Do

27 February,
1827.

498. Do they pay the rates?—There is always a list handed in of persons who, in the judgment of the overseers, are unable to pay the rate; and that list has been very much increased in the last year.

499. If a cottage is inhabited by a pauper, is any rate paid for it at all?—Not if the pauper belongs to the township; but if he belongs to another township, it is paid by the overseer of that township.

500. If the family were removed, would the landlord of the cottage, supposing he was also a select vestryman, suffer the house to become vacant, or to be pulled down?—I should conceive that he would be very unwilling to do either.

501. If he were to seek for a tenant, would he prefer one who had a settlement in the parish to one that had not?—I think decidedly one that had a settlement.

502. What would be his reason for doing so?—That he would be sure of his rent.

503. What would be the effect of the parish refusing to pay any rent?—The landlord would proceed to distrain; and in one or two cases of refusal, a distress was issued, and an arrangement was made; I think in one instance the family went into the workhouse, but in only one.

504. Is it to avoid their going into the workhouse that those rents are paid?—Ostensibly.

505. You said that you conceived that the rate of wages in that parish depended upon the competition between the hand-loom and the power-loom trades; did you mean by that to say that the artificers that work in the hand-loom and the power-loom trades are incapable of changing from one to the other?—A hand-loom weaver, as he is situated with us, has no choice, there is no mode of employment of which he can avail himself.

506. Cannot he become a power-loom weaver?—In some instances he might.

507. Supposing that either in the hand-loom trade or the power-loom trade there was a deficiency of labourers, would it not be possible for the labourers in the other trade to change to that trade in which that deficiency existed?—Unquestionably.

508. Then do you conceive that if there were a subtraction of a certain number of families from such a township as that, and a diminution consequently of the number of hands, that the demand for labour occasioned by that would cause a rise of wages in that trade?—I should not anticipate such a subtraction as would produce that effect; I can conceive that if the subtraction were carried to a very great extent, there would not be hands enough either for the hand loom or the power-loom, but I do not anticipate any such event as that; if the subtraction were carried to a certain point, so that it became the interest of the weaver to stay at home, you would have no application for emigration.

509. Do you suppose that the number necessary to be subtracted for the purpose of raising the wages, would be so great that no plan of emigration would reach it?—No plan of emigration of which I have ever seen an outline, would appear to me to reach to the extent anticipated.

510. When you stated that you conceived that the rate of wages depended upon the competition between the two trades, you did not mean to say that if a sufficient number of labourers could be subtracted, the rate of wages would not rise?—Of course it would; but it appears to me that they will never rise in the hand-loom trade, because it is an inferior machine, and will never be resorted to.

511. To the best of your knowledge, independently of weaving, are all the other channels of productive industry in your neighbourhood full?—They are; I would scarcely say full; I am no farmer, but I have heard it stated by a very skilful farmer, that most of our farms are underhanded, that it would be a profitable application of capital to employ an additional number of hands in agriculture; but our farms are small, and the pressure of the poor rates has had the contrary effect, and the consequence is, that the agricultural labourer is almost as much distressed as the weaver.

512. Would not increasing the size of the farms, so far from increasing the number of labourers, be the most certain and direct means of decreasing that number?—I am not of that opinion.

513. It has been stated by a former witness, that a very considerable number of labourers have been forcibly removed from Manchester and its neighbourhood in the last year; have there been many persons so removed from your neighbourhood?—We removed in the months of May and June all that we could.

514. To what amount do you suppose that took place?—They were not very numerous, from the causes I have stated, that most of our manufacturing labourers

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.

27 February,
1837.

have settlements; the proportion is more than usually large of those that have settlements.

515. But there were a certain number removed?—Yes.

516. Supposing the circumstances of the trade in your part of the country were to become more favourable, do you conceive that that would make room for a fresh influx of people?—I have not anticipated any improvement so rapid as to require a greater supply than our own population would furnish.

517. Do you suppose that no fresh influx of people took place in the years 1824 and 1825, when the manufactures were in a great state of activity?—The influx to the towns was very considerable; to the villages by no means so; in fact the tide flowed from the villages to the towns.

518. Are you of opinion that the influx into the towns, of fresh labourers, produces no competition with the labourers in the villages?—I consider that the state of the manufacturing interests, at the period referred to, was a very anomalous state; it was a state produced by many artificial causes, and I imagine that any remarks applicable to that period would not be generally applicable.

519. Judging from what has passed, if a demand from whatever cause did arise, so as to give a greater activity to the manufacture than now exists, would not that circumstance make room for a great influx of the population?—Clearly.

520. In the event of a period of distress again recurring, or difficulty in the employment of labourers, in what situation would those persons be again placed?—I imagine that those who had not a legal settlement would be treated as they have been treated in the last eighteen months; those that had a settlement would of course fall, as they have now fallen, upon the poor rates.

521. Do you not think there would be an indisposition upon the part of the parish to allow fresh persons to obtain legal settlements?—Clearly; we are aware that such indisposition exists in all cases.

522. After the experience of last year, are you not of opinion that every means will be taken to prevent legal settlements being gained?—I conceive the most scrupulous jealousy will be exercised.

523. What are the means which you expect will be used to prevent settlements being gained?—Taking care that the tithements are under the value of 10*l*.

524. Can you prevent persons from taking apprentices?—We cannot.

525. You have stated, that if a certain number of families were provided for by emigration, it would tend to diminish the poor rates; you have also stated, that you think that no landlord who has a cottage would suffer it to be either pulled down or to remain vacant, and that it is decidedly the interest of such landlord to let it to a pauper rather than to a person that is not a pauper; will you state, under those circumstances, in what way you think that the providing for a certain number of families by emigration could lead to a diminution of the poor rates?—I think I have not stated that it is for the interest of the landlord that his tenant should be a pauper, but that he should be a person having a legal settlement, whether a pauper or not.

526. Will you state in what way you think the emigration of a certain number of families would be likely to lead to a reduction of the poor rate?—It appears to me that our case at the present is this; a weaver comes to us with three children, he says, that he is unable to support himself, and accordingly we make him an allowance; he comes the week following, and says that he is expecting a further reduction of wages; we see no limit to this, and in anticipation of the consequences, we are ready to make a considerable effort, provided it be well understood that that effort shall be a beneficial one.

527. How is it to be beneficial?—If you require from us a less actual outlay than we expect a family will cost us during the year.

528. You have stated that you think the emigration of a certain number of families would tend to diminish the total charge upon the parish; in order to prove that, you must show that the places of those that were withdrawn would not be supplied by others equally chargeable; will you state how you consider the relief would occur?—It appears to me that the relief would occur by persons being removed that have a legal settlement, upon the expectation that their places would be supplied, if supplied at all, by persons not having a legal settlement.

529. Is not the master manufacturer more interested in multiplying the number of labourers, than he is in keeping down the poor rate?—Undoubtedly he is.

530. If that parish, having relieved itself in the first instance from its superabundant population, were then to decide that they would give no relief to any man
except

except he were wholly employed by the parish, would not that defeat the object of the master manufacturers, whose interest it is to keep down the price of wages by crowding the parish with a redundant population?—Such a regulation as that would be highly desirable, that in no case should they make up the deficiency of wages, but that relief should be given only in return for employment.

531. Have the magistrates ever interfered to prevent this custom of paying wages out of the poor rates?—Never, in any instance that has come to my knowledge.

532. You have stated that the average rate of relief combined with wages, is half-a-crown a head; therefore a man and his wife and three children would receive 12s. 6d. a week, partly in wages and partly out of the poor rates?—Yes.

533. What is the average rate of wages of agricultural labour in your parish?—The usual rate of a farm servant is 6s. a week, with his board for six days, or from 12. 3d. to 2s. a day; a very good labourer can earn 2s.; but a great proportion of our agricultural labour is performed by piece-work.

534. Do persons employed at piece-work gain more than 12s. a week?—No, I imagine that 2s. is a fair return for the labour of a skilful hand.

535. Then the manufacturer that gets part of his wages out of the poor rate and part from his labour, is better paid than the day-labourer that is maintained entirely by his own labour?—He would be, according to the scale stated.

536. The object of the emigration would be to relieve the hand-loom weavers?—That is the specific object I have in view with regard to my own parish.

537. Does the practice of assisting the wages of the artisan take place in any other trade than that of hand-loom weaving?—During the period of difficulty it was the practice to work what is called short time, that is, the nominal wages being kept at the rate at which they were before the difficulty commenced; the time during which the persons received employment was lessened, either by the subtraction of a portion of each day, or by the omission of some days in the week; that was considered a fair ground of appeal for the assistance of the select vestry. The man said, My nominal wages are 15s. a week, but I have worked only three days, consequently I have earned only 7s. 6d., and therefore you must make it up.

538. Are you of opinion, with reference to the practice of giving settlements in former times, that more power will be found of resisting the introduction of fresh parishioners, or the contrary?—I have contemplated that the relief afforded would be greater than the evil which would occur on the other side.

539. You have stated that the relief of the hand-loom weavers will press more and more upon your parish; that as long as you continue to make up the deficiency to those persons in the amount of wages they receive to what is necessary for their subsistence, there will be a tendency in the manufacturers to decrease the amount of wages they pay to them?—I think so.

540. Therefore you are of opinion that those hand-loom weavers being removed, they cannot be succeeded by other hand-loom weavers, for their trade will be destroyed, or by any other class of men who will press so heavily upon the parish; is not that what you anticipate?—That is what I anticipate.

541. And therefore it is your wish to remove those hand-loom weavers?—Considering theirs to be a case of such difficulty and hardship that it is not likely that the circumstances under which they are placed will be revived with respect to any other class of men.

542. You stated that some strangers had lately come to your parish, seeking labour?—They have.

543. What had been the employment of those persons?—We are only seven miles from Macclesfield; perhaps the Committee are aware that advertisements were scattered very widely in the beginning of last year, announcing a demand for 5,000 weavers, and the consequence was, that there was a gathering of every person that could handle a shuttle, from every part of the kingdom, to our neighbourhood.

544. Do you not think that there are a great many persons who employ hand-loom weavers, from their incapacity to become proprietors of power-looms, who will continue so to do?—I imagine that there must be many persons in that situation; but I conceive they will find it expedient to transfer their capital to some other mode of manufacturing industry; they never can maintain a competition with a less useful machine against a more useful machine.

545. As long as they do, is it not their direct interest to have the wages of the hand-loom weaver as low as possible?—Clearly, they have the power in their own

The Rev.
J. M. Turner.
23 February,
1837.

hands; they pay the man 7s. this week, if they choose to make it 5s. the next week there is no possibility of resisting it, because the other 2s. will be made up from the parish rates.

546. You do not conceive that Irishmen will come over to obtain employment in hand-loom weaving, when your own hand-loom weavers shall become extinct?—We have no Irish weavers settled with us, except a small proportion of apprentices.

547. If a sufficient proportion of your population were withdrawn, to raise the rate of wages, have you any doubt that the master manufacturer who now takes apprentices, would increase the number of those apprentices?—I conceive it would be his interest to get his work done in the most economical way.

548. That would be by increasing the number of his apprentices?—I imagine it would be so.

549. Has your select vestry never endeavoured to enforce the law, by refusing to pay rents or to make payments in aid of wages out of the poor rate?—It has been suggested to the select vestry; we have attempted to enforce it, but I am not aware of its having been enforced.

550. You have never refused assistance?—I am not aware that it has been refused.

551. Have any of those hand-loom weavers been accustomed in any degree to agricultural habits?—In some degree; they are accustomed to set potatoes for themselves every year.

552. Do any of the agricultural labourers receive relief in your parish?—Very few; the proportion of agricultural labourers receiving relief is very small; up to the beginning of last year we had no adult healthy person receiving relief.

553. Has this question of Emigration excited any attention in that part of the country?—In my own parish I should say that it has not; though, I have been away some weeks; I imagine that in the large towns in our neighbourhood it has been entertained with great anxiety.

554. You are aware that in case of this plan of emigration being carried into effect, no parties would be taken except they were able bodied, in full health, and in the prime of life, and utterly without employment?—I understood it to apply only to such parties as are now described, the healthy and the industrious.

555. Can you state about the average number of persons that have gained settlements in your parish by serving apprenticeship?—In the factory I have alluded to, which perhaps comprises the whole, there are, I believe, from eighty to one hundred apprentices, and about one-seventh of that number gain settlements every year.

556. Are the tithes rated in your parish?—They are.

557. Assuming that in Ireland the rate of wages is infinitely lower than in England, and that a free intercourse exists between the two countries on very cheap terms, must not the tendency of such a system be to lower the rate of wages in England to an approximation to those in Ireland?—I conceive we experience that annually; because our rate of wages in harvest would be much higher than it is, if it were not for the Irish who come over.

558. Do you see any other possible termination to it, than that of lowering the rate of wages in England, and bringing them nearer to the rate of wages in Ireland?—I can see none.

559. Supposing emigration to take place from England to any considerable extent, and no emigration to take place from Ireland, would not the effect of that emigration be to increase the influx of Irish labourers into England?—I conceive that it would; but it would not be felt by our parishes as so great a grievance, inasmuch as the Irish labourers would not have a settlement.

560. Do you conceive that any measure in Ireland which has a tendency to raise the condition of the people and to provide them with productive employment, would have the effect of diminishing this evil, as affecting England?—I should conceive that if it were their interest to stay at home, we should see but little of them in Cheshire.

561. You said that the practice of paying a part of the wages of labour and the rents of cottages out of the poor rates, applied only to the hand-loom weavers and to the spinners?—I am not aware of any other trade in which it has been necessary to have recourse to that.

562. Supposing the wages in the power-loom trade were very low, is there any reason why the same principle should not be applied to it?—None whatever.

563. Then the only reason it has not been applied in that case is, that the wages in the power-loom trade have been sufficient for the support of a family upon the terms

terms you have laid down?—I can imagine no other reason than that the wages have been adequate.

564. What is the saving of labour effected by the power-loom?—I cannot speak with any thing like accurate knowledge upon the subject, I can only speak to the difference of quality in the fabric, which the most unpractised eye can detect.

565. Supposing a certain quantity of goods were to be manufactured, how many labourers would it take to manufacture it with the power-loom, as compared with the hand loom?—I am not prepared to state that; but if the master manufacturer gives out a certain quantity of yarn to be woven by twenty different weavers, he gets twenty different qualities of cloth, whereas if he puts it into a power-loom, it is all of precisely the same quality.

566. From your knowledge of the state of your parish, do you believe that the owners of the land would consent to mortgage for a term of years the poor rate, for the specific purpose of emigration?—I do not see that the owner of the land has any thing to do with it.

567. Do you think that those persons who by law are entrusted with the appropriation of the parochial rate, would be disposed to charge that rate, under certain conditions, for the purposes of emigration?—I think they would.

568. Do you think the landlords would be disposed to object to it?—I do not see how the landlord could interfere in it.

569. Has the landlord any interest in interfering?—I think not.

570. May not the occupier who votes in the select vestry for this prospective charge of ten years, quit his tenement in the course of six months, and leave that charge to be borne by others?—Under the present state of the law, such a prospective arrangement would be impossible; we cannot mortgage the rates for ten years.

571. But if, in consequence of this arrangement, he leaves his land with a less annual charge from the rate than the present charge, will not the landlord be materially benefited by it?—I should conceive so.

572. Is not this the result, that it is possible that the present charge may last only six months, and under the course proposed there will be a fixed mortgage payable for ten years to come?—In many cases that might be the result.

573. Are the individuals comprising the select vestry principally renters of land, or landowners?—Renters of land, principally.

Major Thomas Moody, again called in; and Examined.

574. YOU have lately been to the parish of Shipley, in Sussex?—Yes, I have.

575. Had you an opportunity of examining in minute detail, into the circumstances of that parish?—Yes, I had, so far as the assistance I received from the Member for the county, Mr. Walter Barrell, directing certain overseers of that parish, and some farmers, to attend and answer such questions as I might put to them.

576. What is the amount of the population in the parish?—Of the present population I could not get an accurate statement, but from the last returns made to Parliament, the population was 1,159 persons.

577. What is the estimated rental of that parish?—The estimated rental of the parish is 2,599*l.* 5*s.*

578. What is the amount of money which has been applied under the poor rates for the relief of the poor, during the last year?—The sum so applied was 2,314*l.* 11*s.*

579. Can you state in detail to the Committee, the different situations of the parties receiving this parochial assistance?—There were 67 men, who were employed upon the public roads; there were also aged and infirm persons without families, unable to work upon that or any other kind of work, 6; widows without children, 15; widows with children, 5; illegitimate children under twelve years of age, 8; children under twelve years of age, 113; exclusive of other children in the parish that do not receive relief; for though relief is given for only 113 children, yet the parents of those children have 262; it was only when the parents had beyond a certain number of children, that they became entitled to parochial relief for such excess.

580. What was that number?—That number was 3; no allowance is paid but for a number in one family exceeding 3 children, to the best of my recollection; besides these, there were inmates in the workhouse (those I have mentioned not

Major
Thomas Moody.

27 February,
1837.

being in the workhouse) 15 men, 14 women, 26 boys, and 15 girls, making a total of 70; these numbers make a total of 287 persons, who are receiving parochial relief in some form or other. There was another class of labourers amounting to 233 persons, who were thus distributed among the holders of land: in proportion as a farmer held a rental of 10*l*., if it was poor land, he was obliged to receive one of those 233 labourers, who were a distinct class of labourers from those I have already mentioned, as being dependent upon the parish rates in the manner stated. This was, to all intents and purposes, also supplying the people to a certain extent with the means of subsistence out of the parish. When the land was of a middling quality, for every 11*l*. of rental, only one of these persons was received; and where the land was of good quality, there was one for every 12*l*. of rental. The reason for this distribution was, that in proportion as the rental was low, it was supposed that the land was poor, and consequently required a greater portion of labour, in proportion to the space, to cultivate it.

581. Of those 233 labourers you have just mentioned, what proportion were considered, by the inhabitants of the parish generally, as forming in point of fact an excess beyond the labour required in that parish?—According to the testimony of Mr. Richard Martin, one of the employers, and which was agreed to by all the others, both in the parish of Shipley and the neighbouring one, it was, that a man that held a rental of 100*l*. being obliged by those means to employ nine of those people, he was over-handed to the amount of three persons at least.

582. That out of the nine he employed, he could have employed six with advantage, and that the other three were more than he wanted?—Yes; and the opinion of the whole of the Shipley farmers was, that in consequence of their being obliged to employ this excess of labour, they adopted a course of crops for which their land was not suited.

583. Will you describe that course of crops?—First, fallow; second, wheat; third, oats; fourth, grass seed.

584. Why were exhausting crops necessary?—To employ the people; they draw a great quantity of lime, and make compost heaps, and forced a course of white crops of wheat and oats twice in four years, otherwise, in their opinion, they would not have been able to pay their rates.

585. You have stated, that the sum of 2,314*l*. was paid in poor rates; have you the means of informing the Committee of the general details of the appropriation of that sum?—I have not, beyond what I have stated; but what I have given was from books which will supply the details.

586. The excess of labour, with respect to those 233 labourers, is to be considered as independent of the actual pecuniary payment made by that parish out of the poor rates?—Independent of the sum paid out of the poor rates.

587. What is the amount of average wages paid to those 233 labourers?—I cannot state that precisely in each case; the average rate of wages of those persons was 9*s*. a week. A labourer, having only two children, and deriving nothing from the parish, and constantly employed, would during forty-six weeks obtain perhaps about 10*s*. a week, amounting to 23*l*.; and during hay time and harvest, for six weeks, he would obtain 21*s*. a week, amounting to 6*l*. 6*s*. amounting altogether to 29*l*. 6*s*. I have no estimate of the wages of a man, having a wife and four children: forty-six weeks, the man at 10*s*., 23*l*.; the average gains of the woman during the year, particularly at hay time and harvest, 5*l*. 4*s*.; six weeks of the wages of the man during hay time and harvest, at 21*s*. per week, 6*l*. 6*s*.; for a child he received 2*l*. 12*s*. from the parish, and the rent of his cottage, which was 3*l*. from the parish; by which the total income of the man, from all those sources, amounted to 40*l*. 2*s*.

588. Will you now state to the Committee the circumstances of a man receiving parish relief by direction of the magistrates, as compared with that employed labourer?—In this case he will receive for forty-six weeks, under the same circumstances as to family, 9*s*. a week, amounting to 20*l*. 14*s*.; his wife's and his own wages during harvest and hay time, would be 11*l*. 10*s*. as before, making 32*l*. 4*s*.; the sum for rent and the child being the same, would be 5*l*. 12*s*.; the sum total of this would be 37*l*. 16*s*. making a difference of 2*l*. 6*s*. whether he was employed as an entirely free labourer, or whether he was obliged to depend upon the parish for employment.

589. What were the number of persons paying rates in the parish?—Thirty-five.

590. What number of persons were there that ought to pay rate, that could not pay?—There were six small tradesmen that did pay some rate; there were also

1017-

17 February,
1827.

forty-nine cottages that were liable to rent, equal to 45*l.* per annum, but unable to pay rate without the aid of the parish.

591. Did the parish pay it?—Yes.

592. What did they inform you was the expense per annum at which they would estimate a man, a woman, and three children, absolutely unemployed?—I do not recollect that there was a particular sum, but the expense of it has been already detailed; and they were very willing, they said, to pay any sum less than that, in order to have those removed whose services were not wanted.

593. Was there a select vestry in this parish?—I do not know.

594. Did you see the overseers of this parish?—Yes.

595. Were they aware that the practice of paying wages out of the rates, is illegal?—I do not know whether they were so informed.

596. Are there many gentlemen residing in this parish?—It appears to me that there are none actually resident.

597. Did you understand that that parish was peculiar, or did you understand that the adjoining parishes were very much in the same way?—The next parish was much in the same way, and I understood was general in what is called the Wealds of Sussex; at least so it appeared to me, from the information I had.

598. What was the class of owners of land in that parish?—They are gentlemen, as I apprehend. The Brother of the Member for the County is one, and the Member himself, I believe, is another; I do not know any other individually.

599. Had you any opportunity of knowing their sentiments respecting the circumstances of the parish?—Yes; Mr. Walter Burrell returned to his house when those examinations were gone through, and he saw the overseer of one of the parishes after I had done with him. I do not know what conversation passed between him and these persons.

600. Are there many owners in this parish, either residing or non-resident?—I do not know positively, but I believe none.

601. You were understood to state, that the greater the number of children that a labourer had, the greater was the allowance he received?—Yes.

602. What did a young unmarried man, without a family, get?—I suppose he would not get more than 10*s.* a week, the value of his labour.

603. Would not he get less than 10*s.*?—No, I apprehend not as average wages, unless on the parish list, when perhaps it would be 9*s.*

604. What would a married man with three children get?—He would get an extra shilling for each child beyond that number, and the usual wages when he had two or three; I am not certain as to the number.

605. Did you understand that no employment could be found in any neighbouring parish for those persons?—So I understood, though some resided in neighbouring parishes, yet drew relief from Shipley.

606. Did not they consider that they were attached to the spot without any hope whatever of being able to provide for them, otherwise than by charity?—Certainly; and the rate payers are willing to pay any expense less than that which they are now paying, in order to get rid of them.

607. Are there any paupers resident in the parish without settlements, or have they all settlements?—Some of them do not reside in the parish, but yet derive relief from the parish, that have settlements in the parish. The rate payers were very anxious that a system of destruction of cottages should follow the removal of paupers.

608. Do the families live in separate cottages?—No, many of them have now got into one cottage; it was stated to me, that forty years ago a cottage that only held a man and his wife and three children, now contains five families, consisting of nineteen persons.

609. Has the number of cottages increased within the last few years?—I understand it has; but an increase of population had still taken place by putting more people into one cottage than there had been before.

610. Are any rents paid out of the poor rates?—Yes, rents of cottages, to the amount of 45*l.*

611. What does that average for each cottage by the year?—I do not know the number of cottages, but I understood there were forty-nine persons whose rents were paid by the parish.

612. Are the cottages the property of the owners of the soil?—I presume so, but I am not certain,

Major
Thomas Moody.

27 February,
1837.

613. You have stated that 233 persons were distributed among the landholders in this parish, in the proportion of nine persons to every 100*l.* of rent; do you happen to know if those persons hired any servants, independently of those people who were so forcibly put upon them?—During the harvest I should suppose they must have hired other persons, but I cannot say what happened at other times of the year. Some persons held farms in the parish who did not live in it, such must have confidential servants.

614. Did you make any inquiries as to the willingness of the occupiers or of the owners in this parish, to mortgage for a definite period the poor rates of the parish, to raise a sum of money for the purpose of emigrating a portion of the surplus population of the parish?—So far as regards the owners of the parish I had not an opportunity of seeing any one, except Mr. Walter Burrell; the other people that I saw were farmers, and they were all very willing.

615. Do the farmers hold under leases for a term of years, or are they tenants at will?—I understood that they were tenants at will in general.

616. What is the general currency of their leases when under that tenure?—I do not know precisely.

617. Did you make any inquiry into the circumstances of any other parish in Sussex?—Only the parishes of Shipley and West Grinstead, which adjoin to one another.

Jovis, 1^o die Martii, 1837.

John Maxwell, Esq. a Member of the Committee; Examined.

John Maxwell,
Esq.

1 March,
1837.

618. HAVE you had an opportunity of seeing the evidence given by Mr. Campbell, Mr. Drummond, and Mr. Kennedy?—I have.

619. Do you generally agree in the statements made by those gentlemen?—As far as I have examined them, I concur in them.

620. How many petitions have you had to present from that part of the country upon the subject of emigration?—Nine.

621. Do those relate to the county of Renfrew exclusively?—I think they are all from the county of Renfrew; one is from Irish settlers in it.

622. You cannot speak particularly as to the situation of the population in Lanarkshire?—No; but from conversation, I believe it to be very similar to that of the county of Renfrew.

623. Is Lanarkshire as populous a county as Renfrewshire?—Not in proportion to its extent, I have reason to believe.

624. But altogether there is as large a number of inhabitants in Lanarkshire as in Renfrewshire?—I should think larger.

625. Do you therefore conceive that there is as large a number of persons in a situation of distress in Lanarkshire as in Renfrewshire?—I could not exactly speak to that fact.

626. Do you happen to know whether or not the unemployed persons in Lanarkshire are hand-loom weavers; which are the class of persons who are unemployed in Renfrewshire?—I believe almost entirely; because when the weavers experience a difficulty in finding employment in their own trade, they have recourse to country labour, and thereby cause distress amongst the labourers; but it originates in the weaving trade.

627. From your general impression upon the subject, are you of opinion that any other remedy presents itself for improving the condition of those persons out of employment in Renfrewshire, than that of emigration?—I think emigration will be essentially necessary to commence any effectual remedy.

628. Do you discover any remedies for the distress which has of late prevailed in the district of country of which you have been speaking?—I think the recurrence of a similar distress among the manufacturing population might be greatly diminished, if not altogether removed.

629. By what means?—I think if the persons who give employment to labourers, and the persons in whose houses they reside, were made in some degree responsible that the persons employed and housed by them were not to be left so exclusively chargeable to the parish, that that would go a great way to prevent the recurrence of the distress which now prevails in country parishes.

630. If a large proportion of the present distressed persons were removed from the district of country to which you allude, do you discover any other means by which

which that gap might be prevented from being supplied by persons from other parts of the country, in the event of a better state of employment arising?—In addition to what I have already said, I think that giving some power of removal to assist parishes to which this surplus population usually flows, would contribute to prevent the settlement of an undue population in those districts. It is the custom for persons who have contracts to make roads, ditches and canals, and for all persons who are establishing manufactures, not only to encourage the Irish to come, but there have been cases stated, where they have sent advertisements to Ireland, requesting the population to come, on the prospect of a great supply of work, and the consequence is, that a great quantity of Irish come, who settle as weavers, because there is no law of apprenticeship now which fetters them in adopting that trade as soon as their employer finishes his contract or has no employment.

631. In what manner do those people, so introduced, gain permanent settlements?—By residing three years without receiving charity; but they frequently beg in the parish adjoining, which saves them from the operation of that law; they send also their wives and children to beg there.

632. Your father is one of the largest proprietors in the neighbourhood of Glasgow; has he contributed largely of late to the relief of the poor in that neighbourhood?—He has.

633. Do you conceive that he, and other proprietors situated as he is, would lend any considerable assistance for the removal of any portion of the surplus population that now exists in that neighbourhood?—I conceive that he might contribute to aid persons to emigrate, provided he saw that by so doing he would be protected from a new accumulation of labour for which there is no demand.

634. Would he be prepared to give that money, or to lend it?—I cannot speak exactly to that, but I conceive that he might be disposed to do either, according to the recommendation of the Committee, and the nature and extent of that protection; but I speak entirely from conjecture.

635. Do you think that accumulation of labour could be prevented?—I think that it might in a great measure be prevented.

636. Will you have the goodness to state in what manner you think it might be prevented?—I think if the persons who now endeavour to introduce labourers for the purpose of lowering the rate of wages should feel the burden of supporting unemployed labourers who become settlers, that they probably would rather give a higher rate of wages to the population they now have, than seek for a foreign population for the purpose of reducing the wages.

Mr. William Spencer Northhouse, of the London Free Press Newspaper, late of Glasgow, called in; and Examined.

637. YOU are authorized, on the part of certain Emigration Societies in Scotland, to lay their case before this Committee?—I am.

638. Will you state the names of the societies so authorizing you?—For the county of Renfrew: the Paisley Friendly Emigration Society; the Paisley Caledonian Emigration Society, N° 1; the Paisley Canadian Emigration Society; the Barrhead and Neilston Emigration Society; the Paisley and Suburbs Emigration Society; the Elderslie Emigration Society; the Paisley Caledonian Emigration Society, N° 2; the Paisley Friendly Emigration Society; the Lochwinnoch Emigration Society, and the Paisley Brooklands Emigration Society. I am also authorized by the following Emigration Societies in Lanarkshire: the Glasgow St. George's Parish Societies, N° 1 and 2; the Barony Middle Ward Society; the East Barony Society; the Parkhead Society; the North Quarter Society; the Calton Society, N° 1; the Calton Clyde-street Society; the Underston Society; the Gorbals Society; the Tradeston Society; the College Parish Society; the Bell-street Society; the Old Monkland Society; the Rutherglen Society; the Bridgeton Society; the Camachie Society; the Govan Society; the St. John's Parish Society; the Springburn Society; the Campsie Society; the Kirkintilloch Society, and the Eaglesham Society.

639. What is the aggregate number of persons constituting those societies?—The societies in Renfrewshire comprise 634 families, and 3,364 individuals; the societies in Lanarkshire comprise 1,618 families; I do not know the number of individuals; if they were taken in the same proportion as those in Renfrewshire, it would be about 8,500 individuals.

640. Is the Glasgow Emigration Society one of those you represent?—No.

John Macneil,
Esq.

1 March,
1827.

Mr.
W. S. Northhouse.

Mr.
W. S. Northouse.
1 March,
1847.

641. Are there any other emigration societies in that part of the country, besides those you have mentioned?—I believe there may be a few, but there are only a few.

642. Are the greater part of the individuals composing those societies, hand-loom weavers?—Nearly the whole of the societies I have mentioned are hand-loom weavers; I believe the Glasgow Society is composed of cotton-spinners principally, and persons who are in rather better circumstances than the miserable individuals I represent.

643. Do you consider the greater part of the persons composing those societies to be at the present moment in a state of want and destitution, arising from the less demand which exists for their labour?—Not so much from a less demand for their labour, as from the inadequate payment of their labour; I believe the demand is much better now than it was formerly; there are not many individuals at present out of work.

644. What is the cause to which the low rate of wages is to be attributed under circumstances of an improved demand?—Because the demand is not yet sufficient to employ the whole of the hands; I suppose there are from 500 to 600 at least, at present out of employment; formerly I believe there were that number of thousands.

645. To what county do you allude?—To both Renfrewshire and Lanarkshire.

646. Have you reason to suppose that there is any chance of such an improvement in the trade, as to employ, at adequate wages, the individuals who belong to that trade?—It is utterly impossible under any circumstances; machinery has already superseded to a very great extent the hand-loom weavers, and it continues to improve and to be appropriated to other fabrics than those to which it has been hitherto appropriated; and I can mention as a fact, that even with the excessive demand occasioned by the peculiar circumstances of last year, when there was more than double the quantity made than could be sold, and every market in the world was glutted, still the whole of the weavers were not employed, and their wages continued to decrease.

647. Are you of opinion that if those weavers who are now in the situation of being redundant workmen were to be removed, that machinery would increase beyond what at present exists, supposing there were a great increase of demand for the article?—I have not the least doubt of machinery increasing.

648. Do you not therefore, in point of fact, consider that machinery is at this moment kept in some measure in abeyance by the circumstance of there being that redundant population out of employment?—To a certain extent it is; but machinery must always govern the wages of manual labour.

649. Under those circumstances you do not consider that any injury would accrue to the capitalist, from the abstraction of that portion of the population which may be considered as entirely redundant?—Great benefit must accrue to the capitalist, as the capitalist at present, from mere feelings of humanity, has to do much towards the sustenance of those persons whom he cannot employ.

650. Although you have stated the generality of persons belonging to those societies to be at this moment in a condition of great poverty and distress, arising from the lowness of their wages, are you not of opinion that the removal of a comparatively small proportion of them, as compared with the whole, would have the effect of improving the condition of the remainder, so as to put them in a much better situation?—Decidedly so, and in a far greater ratio than the mere number that is taken away.

651. Have the members of those societies connexions in the North American provinces?—Many of them have connexions.

652. In any particular province?—I am not aware exactly of the particular province, they are distributed pretty generally through Upper Canada; there are several locations. I have some letters in my possession now, and many letters may be laid before the Committee, in which they say that they are exceedingly desirous that their friends in Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire should join them.

653. Has not the condition of those hand-loom weavers been deteriorating during the period in which machinery has been progressively introduced in weaving?—I do not consider that machinery is the cause of the deterioration of those persons; it is one among many causes that have produced that deterioration.

654. Is it not the fact, that the work that those persons would execute can be executed by machinery to a much cheaper and equally effectual manner?—Certainly.

655. Under

655. Under those circumstances, provided that the circumstances of society are such that there is no demand for the labour of those persons in any other trade or occupation, does not it necessarily follow, that the introduction of that machinery must place them in a state of destitution and want?—I think machinery is not the primary cause of the destitution of those persons, although it is one of the peculiar circumstances that promoted that destitution; in one sense, machinery has occasioned a greater demand for labour, inasmuch as it has made the goods considerably cheaper, but not in proportion to the persons whom it has thrown out of employment.

656. Is it not the fact, however, that the existence of machinery will of necessity prevent those people pursuing with advantage the trade in which they were brought up?—Most assuredly it will govern the rate of their wages.

657. Are those people in general without the means, on their own part, of contributing towards the expense of their emigration?—So far are they from possessing any means, that for a considerable length of time many of them, contrary to their principles, feelings and habits, have been obliged to receive contributions from the relief committees; they were, I believe, in a great measure supported by the Metropolitan Relief Committee, and by donations at home, and they are in such a state of absolute destitution, that many of them have had their articles of household furniture, and their very beds, pawned at the pawnbrokers, and they have been obliged to be redeemed by this relief society; and in addition, nearly the whole of them have received notices to quit. One poor woman, after being two days without food, was delivered of a child in that condition, having nothing but water to subsist upon. Meetings of the landlords of their houses have taken place in various parts, and the landlords have come to the resolution not to allow them to remain any longer than next Whitsunday; they have already seized many of their looms, and sold them by public auction; and they have stated as a reason for adopting that course, that they (the landlords) are positively giving their property to men who ought to be supported, either by the government or by the manufacturers who employ them. There have been public meetings of the landlords; one landlord stated the fact, that he had about 160 weavers at a village called Springburn; I believe it to be a fact, that he has not received a proportion of 2s. in the pound for his rents for the last 18 months. I know of another who has a mortgage upon his property at 1-3d part of its supposed value, for which he pays 70*l.* a year interest, and he has not received 20*l.* for the last 18 months.

658. Are you aware that the distresses of that part of the country have been considerably mitigated by liberal subscriptions, which have been transmitted by the London Relief Committee in aid of them?—I have no doubt that the immediate distresses of the people are mitigated, but it required more than present and uncertain charity to give any thing like consolation to the people.

659. Supposing no increased demand to take place for the products of the handloom weavers, so as to raise their wages, and that the relief transmitted from this country were to cease, would not one of these two consequences necessarily arise, either that the distress of those parties would be aggravated in a dreadful degree, or that the maintenance of them, and the support of them, would fall upon the district to which they belong?—If there were no increased demand, the people would starve to death.

660. In the case of a man, a woman, and three children (taking that as the ratio of a family) utterly without means of employment, that is, for whose services no real demand exists, who may be employed out of charity, but not with a view to any beneficial result, and who consequently are left entirely to be maintained by a contribution of some sort or other; what is the lowest estimate per head at which you can calculate the subsistence of those persons per annum?—I would say the lowest estimate per head of the subsistence of five persons, would be about 30*s.*; that would be for the whole about 15*l.* per annum for the whole family.

661. You consider therefore, the proposition being that they are utterly without employment, that they can be maintained in existence for 15*l.* per annum?—I do; many have been sustained for less.

662. What is the total expense which is incurred in respect of a family of five persons, including not only subsistence, but every other expense?—I should think that a family of five persons have been in many instances sustained at less than 5*s.* a week, without charity; some even at less than 4*s.* a week.

663. Do you mean including rent and clothing?—I cannot say that they have paid for any rent or clothing.

Mr.
W. S. Northcote.
1 March,
1837.

Mr.
W. S. Northhouse,
1 March,
1827.

664. At what amount should you estimate the other necessary expenses for such a family?—I think clothing for a poor family, such as they generally wear, might be got for about 2*l.* per annum; I think the rent would amount to 1*s.* 6*d.* per week, which would be about 4*l.* per annum; and I think fuel, with light, would at least amount to 1*s.* per week, making 2*l.* 12*s.* per annum.

665. Would not, therefore, the calculation stand thus: 13*l.* for food, 2*l.* for clothing, 2*l.* 12*s.* for firing and candles, and 4*l.* for lodging; making altogether 21*l.* 12*s.* as the expense absolutely necessary to be incurred, from some quarter or other, in the preservation and subsistence of a family consisting of a man, a woman, and three children, who, by the terms of the proposition, are altogether out of employment during the year?—I do.

666. Do you not know, or have you not heard, of families who subsist upon less than that sum?—Many; but they have been partly sustained by charity.

667. You have stated to the Committee, that on Whitsunday next a considerable number of weavers will be dispossessed of their habitations; do you know what is to become of those persons under those circumstances?—I know what their own feelings are; the whole of them depend upon the legislature sending them out of the country; and if the legislature does not, they will have to build a temporary residence with what materials they can get in the public greens, and take such food as they can procure by force, I presume, from those that have a surplus quantity.

668. What has been the cause, according to your judgment, of the extraordinary patience which those persons have exercised in this their bitter distress?—The hope of emigration.

669. You attribute their patience to no other cause?—I know it has no other cause; I know that in many instances I myself have been obliged to give them every encouragement that I could conscientiously give them, in order to prevent their breaking out into absolute riot.

670. Has not the poverty and misery of the population in some of the manufacturing districts about Glasgow and Paisley, been as great as can well be imagined?—I never could, until I had seen it, imagine the possibility of such distress; it has been the bare tenacity of life, if I may use the phrase. I have no hesitation in saying, that the poor people themselves have sufficient mind not to ascribe the evils they have endured to machinery, but to taxation weighing upon labour, and restrictions preventing markets.

671. Are you of opinion, under all the circumstances, that these evils, unlike others, have no capacity in themselves to cure themselves?—They have not; I am rather of opinion, that where distress exists to a very great degree, population goes on increasing; inasmuch as the unfortunate beings become reckless and desperate, and marry without thought.

672. What is the peculiar species of manufacture which a hand-loom weaver follows in that district?—Principally book muslins, and a variety of fabrics of a coarser and a finer nature, which I cannot describe, not being in the trade.

673. Has there not been, from various causes, a diminution in the last year of the demand for that particular branch of manufacture?—I should think in consequence, in some degree, of the alteration of the paper currency, there was a considerable diminution in the making of those goods.

674. Did you ever hear of a diminution in the exportation of book muslins?—There must be a great diminution in exportation, when the means of speculation are taken away from the parties.

675. You consider that diminution in exportation to be one cause of the distress that exists?—It is one of the immediate causes; I look upon the mediate causes to be other circumstances, which I am not called upon to state.

676. Have you any knowledge as to the state of those parties now in Canada?—I have; I know that many that went over to Canada in a state of utter destitution in 1820, are now in a state of comparative happiness; many of them have written to their friends desirous of coming over, telling them that they certainly encountered great hardships for 18 or 20 months, but that after that time they found that their situation got progressively better, and that they would gladly endure five times the amount of hardship, in order to be placed in the situation in which they now are.

677. Have you any knowledge as to the expense of conveying those people to Canada, and of locating them there?—I have; I believe that in the year 1820, about 700*l.* was paid to a vessel, at the rate of about 4*l.* or 5*l.* per head, including provisions, and I know that at that time another vessel might have been got for about 400*l.*, little more than 50 per cent upon the sum; and I am sure if it were left

to the intended emigrants themselves, they would find the means of going upon a far more economical plan than other persons could do for them, and for this reason, that the whole of the Scotch emigrants contemplate the repayment of any money that may be advanced for their use by Parliament, and would of course expend as little as they could.

678. On what grounds do they feel that confidence of being enabled to repay the sums advanced?—From the evidence they have of the accumulating wealth of those who have already gone out; and I may say the Scotch poor are as remarkable for their honesty as for any feeling by which they are characterised.

679. Do you know of any instances in which persons have been enabled to repay any sums that may have been advanced for the purpose of their emigration?—I do not know that it has ever been tried upon that plan.

680. Then it is presumed you are of opinion that the cheapest mode of emigrating those persons, would be to supply them with some funds, and to leave the rest to them?—For greater safety, and likewise to remove certain objections in some quarters as to their leaving Canada for the United States, I should recommend that the government did not give them any money, but establish in the different towns the means of giving them rations of food, either weekly or monthly, until they were enabled to supply themselves.

681. Have you had an opportunity of reading the Evidence that was given before the Committee on Emigration in the last year?—I have.

682. Have you read the very minute detail that is given of the manner in which the emigrants were settled in 1823 and 1825?—I have.

683. Have you any reason to know whether any of those persons belonging to those emigration societies, have seen that Report?—I believe many of them have seen it.

684. Are you to be understood to state that they are fully prepared to repay at the earliest period compatible with their means, that is, to pay interest redeemable at will, for any money which may be advanced for their location, upon the cheapest principle on which it can be carried into effect?—I am ready on their part to state, that not only will they enter into any single bond for that purpose, but they will enter into joint and several bonds for each other, and they will get their friends also in Canada, who have expressed their willingness to do so, to enter into joint and several bonds with them for the repayment of the money that would be advanced.

685. Is it not true that those men, notwithstanding their miseries, have very just ideas in general with respect to the effects of machinery?—They have generally just ideas as to the effects of machinery; their misery has in some instances blinded their views respecting machinery, as it has done in other parts of the country, but they generally ascribe their distress to other causes.

686. Are you not of opinion, from what you know of the western part of Scotland, that had it not been for the application of charity from the various sources from whence it has been derived, a portion of the population must have perished?—I know that a portion of the population must have perished, had it not been for that charity; and I know that those who have accepted of that charity, have gone with the feeling of almost plunging their hands into the fire to save their lives.

687. You have stated, that a great portion of the persons who are now employed as hand-loom weavers are in a state of distress; what are the wages of those persons who are now employed?—It is according to the peculiar fabric upon which they are employed; on the coarser fabrics, the utmost extent of their wages I take to be about 3s. 6d. per week, working sixteen hours per day.

688. What will a family of five persons earn in a week, supposing them to consist of a man, a woman, and three children of the ages of fourteen, eight and three?—The children of the ages of fourteen and eight would be employed, and the man and woman would be employed; by their combined exertions they might earn about 5s. 6d. per week at the coarser fabrics.

689. You appear to anticipate a further employment of those persons who are now out of employment; if the whole should be employed, do you conceive that the present rate of wages will continue?—I do not anticipate a further increase; I think the present increase is the mere revulsion of the tide, and will not last; I anticipate a decrease of the present employment; I think that employment has arrived near its maximum.

690. Do you consider that the average earnings of the persons composing those societies whose names you have mentioned, amount to about 5s. 6d. a week for a family

Mr.
W. B. Northman.

1 March,
1867.

a family of five persons?—I should think their average earnings are not more than from 5s. 6d. to 6s.

691. Then the expense incurred by the country for those persons, either by public funds or private charity, is the difference between the sum so obtained as wages, and that which you allege to be the minimum expense at which they can live?—Certainly, unless they starve for a certain length of time.

692. Then that difference will be about 7l. 6s. per annum?—I have no doubt of it.

693. That you conceive to be about the average expense that those people are to the country at the present time?—That is the least average expense.

694. In stating 21l. 12s. to be the minimum at which you think a family, consisting of a man, a woman, and three children, could be maintained, do you mean to say that you think it a desirable thing that the wages of that class of the community should be no higher than that?—I mean to say that I consider it a desirable thing for the general good, that the wages of labour should be as low as possible; but I mean to say that for the welfare of the people in those districts, it is absolutely necessary that the wages should be much higher.

695. Supposing the wages of labour to be doubled, if machinery can supply the place of labour, will not the profits of the capitalist remain the same?—I should answer that question by putting another case; supposing that all restrictions upon the sale of the goods were removed, then the increase of the demand would cause a rise in the price of wages, it would enable the capitalist to employ the whole of the men, and give him a return for his capital; I mean to say, supposing the corn laws were repealed.

696. How much did those persons, who are now unemployed, earn two years ago, when they were in a state of full employment?—In 1816, the amount of their earnings was about 16s. per week; they gradually became smaller and smaller, from both mediate and immediate causes, till about two years ago they were six shillings a week, and they are now on an average about 3s. 9d. or 4s. a week.

697. Then if a full state of employment were to take place, upon what ground do you suppose that the high wages, which existed in 1816, will not occur again?—Because in 1816 machinery was not employed upon the same fabrics that it is employed upon now; it is continually invading one fabric after another, and machinery must always determine the wages of manual labour; if a man make a machine, it costs him so much money as capital; the interest of that money amounts to so much, and it costs him so much in the working, and he will always determine in his own mind whether that machinery costs a greater or a smaller sum than so many labourers producing the same quantity of work, and he will take that which is the cheapest.

698. You have stated, that you represent here eleven thousand persons, who are desirous of emigrating; do you conceive that it will be necessary to remove those eleven thousand persons, to produce relief in that part of the country?—I have no hesitation in saying, that the removal of a single individual produces a quantity of relief greater than the amount of what that individual earns, and if one thousand persons are removed, it will produce a greater relief than the supposed earnings of two thousand persons.

699. Will you explain more in detail your reasons for that opinion?—My reason is this; the principles of supply and demand are the same in all trades (except where artificial restrictions exist); when there are more than a given number of hands required by a manufacturer, the surplus, having no employment, will offer to labour for a smaller sum than those who have been fortunate enough to receive employment, and precisely according to the number of that surplus will the wages continue to decrease, until they arrive at the lowest point at which any person will take work, that being measured by the minimum cost of subsistence, and the mode that may exist of getting any subsistence from any other quarter in addition to those wages; but the removal of a number of those surplus hands, and likewise of a number of those that are at present in employment, will cause a greater rise in wages than in the ratio of the wages earned by the persons who were removed; for this reason, that the master manufacturers, instead of giving every one less than his brother manufacturer, will give more, in order to have the advantage of his workmen; thus, if at a given time a manufacturer pays 5s. but cannot employ all the persons who offer to work at 5s., those whom he cannot employ having no other mode of subsistence but the work which he gives out, will offer to do it for 4s. 11d., he may then employ
a certain

a certain number; a few more of the remainder will offer to work for 4 s. 10 d., or 4 s. 9 d., or 4 s. 8 d., or 4 s. 7 d., and so on till it comes down to such a point that the wages will not sustain life, with the aid of all the other support afforded to them; but on the removal of a number of those surplus hands, and also of those at present in employment, one manufacturer will give one penny more to get the labourers of another manufacturer, and that manufacturer again, seeing that he is likely to lose his labourers, will offer three halfpence in order to detain them; and that principle will go on till the wages will find their level by the introduction of new labourers or the return of old ones.

700. Or the substitution of machinery?—Under all circumstances, machinery invariably governs the wages of manual labour.

701. Will not the rise of wages you contemplate check employment, by raising the price of the manufactured article?—It would raise the price of the manufactured article and check employment, just in the same way that a duty upon any particular article will cause a smaller quantity to be sold of that article than would otherwise be sold.

702. With respect to the profits of the manufacturer, must not the expense, which is now in point of fact applied in aid of the wages of labour, be taken into consideration?—Of course, in the same way that the duties which are paid upon articles must be taken into consideration.

703. With respect to the emigration of any parties under those circumstances, do you not imagine that it is more for the interest of the emigrants, and more for the interest of the community, that a settled system should be adopted, under which the whole process should be carried on under some responsible person or persons, rather than by leaving it to the accidental choice of each emigrant, as to the mode that should be pursued?—I have no hesitation in answering that question in the affirmative; but if it refer, as I suppose it does, to time, I must add, that one half of the people who petition for emigration will most assuredly perish for want of subsistence, should the measure be postponed for another year, till plans are matured and perfected.

704. Supposing that those persons were to be located together, locations being prepared for them, roads being made, rations being procured, and all the necessary assistance being given to them, and that under the charge of responsible persons; do you not think that would be as desirable a mode of executing the object, as by scattering those persons over the different parts of the North American provinces, where their friends may happen to be, that course being necessarily attended with much additional expense in transmitting them to those different points?—I have no hesitation in saying that it would be for the benefit of the Canadian population to have roads made, and to have the means of communication; but I imagine that those persons, anticipating the return of this money by themselves, would not like that larger expenses should be incurred than were necessary.

705. Supposing that no expense is incurred but that which is the minimum necessary for the purpose of enabling them to go on by themselves, and to prosper after that assistance is withdrawn; would they object to paying back that expense?—Not in the least.

706. Are you not aware, with respect to rationing those persons, that it can be done at less expense upon an extended scale, than if each individual had to cater for himself in the purchase of necessaries?—I cannot reply to that question; I have no personal knowledge upon the subject.

707. Are you aware of what is meant by the expense to be incurred in locating those parties?—I think I am.

708. There is the passage from this country to Canada?—That they can get cheaper than government.

709. There is the provisioning during the voyage?—That they can get cheaper than government.

710. There is the removal of them from the place of debarkation to the place of their location?—Of that I have no knowledge.

711. There is the finding certain implements which are necessary for settlers in the early period of their settlement?—That I do not know the cost of.

712. There is the purchase, perhaps, of a pig or a cow?—That they would very frequently get from their friends, when they get there.

713. There are their rations for a year, or a year and four months, for the period during which it is necessary that they should be provided with food, prior to their own

Mr.
W. S. Northman.
1 March,
1847.

own crops giving them the means of subsistence?—Under any circumstances, whether cheaper or dearer, I think the government should provide those rations.

714. With respect to the purchase of a pig, you say it would be better that they should receive that from their friends?—I believe they would be generally better pleased to make their own market for their goods.

715. Would not the additional expense that would be incurred in removing them from the place of embarkation to the spot where their friends might happen to be settled, be three times as much as the cost of a pig which was bought for them under any circumstances of their being located together, without that separation?—I did not mean that they should purchase the pig where they land, and take it with them to their location, but that when they got to their location they would get from their friends a pig, or any thing of that sort, out of their surplus stock.

716. Would it not be perfectly impossible to carry on an emigration upon an extended scale, with the plan of locating each person at the point where he might happen to have friends or relations?—I could not give a more accurate view of the circumstances of the people after they got to Canada, than by simply stating, that those who have gone over are comfortable, and, in some instances, would help those who follow them.

717. You were understood in an early part of your evidence to say, that you thought that those parties had better be removed under the care and superintendence of government; you are understood now to say, that it would be better to place money in the hands of those parties, and for them to provide for themselves?—I did not state that I wished the money to be put into the hands of those parties, I merely wished that the parties might have some of the most respectable men connected with Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire to superintend the process of the emigration; I mean to say, that with local friends near their present residences superintending embarkation, those persons would most assuredly do it considerably cheaper than it could be done upon any scale that the government would do it upon.

718. Presuming that all those individuals sincerely wish to repay the government the charges of their removal to America, is there not rather a feeling of jealousy in their minds that they may have more to pay hereafter than would be quite convenient to them?—There is such a feeling.

719. Are they not therefore desirous to be removed upon as cheap terms as possible, with a view to lessen that future payment?—I have no hesitation in saying that they would most gladly emigrate under any circumstances from their present desperate and most deplorable condition, but they would like to find out the cheapest mode themselves (as they have to repay the money) in preference to having it done according to what are usually considered the practices of government.

720. Supposing that their friends at Glasgow were of opinion that the mode of removal that was adopted was the cheapest and the most proper that could be adopted, do you not consider that in that case the emigrants would entirely acquiesce?—They would perfectly acquiesce under any circumstances, and in any mode, as I have said before.

721. You stated that some families went out in the year 1820; under what circumstances did they go out?—There were local committees formed in Glasgow, for the purpose of promoting and facilitating emigration; those committees found out a plan of sending them over for a much smaller sum than has been stated in Parliament; I have no hesitation in saying that instead of costing 20*l.* a head, they may be located and kept for about 12*l.* a head; and it is upon that ground, as well as upon a certain *fans clava* against government practices, that they would rather do it by their own means with government money, than by the means generally adopted by government.

722. You stated, that those families who went out in 1820, have written home to their friends in Scotland, stating their condition?—They have.

723. What has prevented their friends in Scotland who are in a state of distress, from joining them?—The want of means.

724. Do you know any particular impediments that have occurred to prevent a similar emigration to that which took place in 1820?—There are many persons who would have gone over to Canada, being possessed of a small sum of money, who cannot now go over with that sum of money, because by an Act that has been lately passed, insisting upon a certain quantity of tonnage to every passenger, the expenses of emigration have been increased threefold, and the result is, that those
who,

who, having two or three pounds, could formerly get over to America, cannot get over now.

725. Therefore you are of opinion that the Acts which have been passed, regulating the transport of those persons, since 1820, have repressed voluntary emigration?—I am.

Mr
W. S. Northcote.
1 March,
1847.

726. Are you not aware that the success of an emigrant who goes without any capital, must depend upon the demand for his labour when he arrives?—I suppose upon natural principles, that it must be so; but I know there have been few emigrants who have gone from Scotland, who have not got immediate employment for their labour; and in fact, I believe there is a society at Quebec for the purpose of giving some little encouragement and relief to those that are in that destitute condition.

727. If the supply of labour were to be beyond the demand, must not the inevitable consequence be, that those persons would be in a situation of great distress?—The supply of labour in Canada can never be beyond the demand, for a length of time.

728. If 20,000 persons were landed in Canada to-morrow, without one single farthing of capital, do you mean to state that there is such a demand for their service that they would all find employment?—I believe if they could not find sufficient employment, they would find facilities for removing to another country near at hand.

729. Without looking at so large an emigration as one of twenty thousand persons, do you know that persons at present resident in Glasgow have received letters from their friends who have emigrated to Canada, recommending them to come out?—Decidedly so; I am in possession of a great quantity of information upon that subject; the letters are all of the same import, that the persons who have gone over are comfortably settled, and that every year they are improving. They began at the lowest point of very hard labour, and their health improved; and they are in comparatively comfortable circumstances. One old man, that went over in a state of great infirmity and sickness, wrote back to his friends, after he had been four years there, that he was worth 100*l.*; he has a family of five children.

730. Do you believe that if the Passengers Act were repealed, considerable voluntary emigration would take place?—I think much voluntary emigration would take place; but not among the parties that I represent; as to them, it is of little moment whether the passage were 6*l.* or 60*l.*; they have nothing.

731. Supposing it to be admitted that an unnecessary expense is incurred in locating those persons in such a manner that they are likely to prosper, do you suppose they would prefer having no assistance, and being called upon for no repayment, or being assisted in the manner proposed, and after the lapse of eight or nine years being called upon to commence the payment of interest upon the money originally expended in their location?—I have no hesitation in saying that they would most cheerfully subscribe to those terms, and would most gratefully acquiesce in any plan for repayment of interest and principal; they only wish to be taken from the desperate condition in which they are at present placed.

732. You have stated, that if a great number of these families are not relieved before a particular day, they will be turned into the streets on account of rent?—They will be turned out of their houses; because their landlords, for the sake of those poor men, and finding that their present condition is absolutely a gradual death, they have come to the resolution of turning them out by wholesale. There is a village, the whole of which is inhabited by weavers; it belongs to one gentleman; and that gentleman has declared his determination to turn out every one, and to "roup" all their furniture, and to throw his wretched tenants upon the world.

733. Are those families wholly Scotch, or are they some Scotch and some Irish?—They are principally Scotch; but there are many Irish in the Glasgow population.

734. Are they persons who have resided where they are at present three years?—Many much longer.

735. Have you formed any definite opinion with reference to the aggregate number of the parties applying for emigration, as to the number of persons, the removal of whom would tend instantaneously so to improve the condition of the remainder, as to remove the great causes of distress?—I do not think it would remove the causes of distress; as to improving the condition of the poor people, I think that were 1,000

Mr.
W. S. Northcote.

- 1 March,
1827.

families removed only at a very trifling expense, it would considerably better the remainder.

736. You mean 1,000 families, consisting of 5,000 persons?—Yes.

737. Have you ever visited Ireland?—I have.

738. However great the distress may be at Glasgow, or however redundant may be the population in its neighbourhood, is not the distress in Ireland, and the redundant population in Ireland, greater?—I have not been in the south of Ireland, I have only been in the north of Ireland, where the situation of the people is very similar to the situation of the people in Glasgow.

739. If by the abstraction of 1,000 families from the neighbourhood of Glasgow, the condition of the remainder of the working population was improved by a rise in wages, have you any doubt, the state of Ireland remaining the same, that that vacuum would be instantly filled up from that quarter?—I have much doubt that the vacuum would be instantly filled up from that quarter, because the rate of wages must be so low, for some time to come, as to offer little temptation even to an Irishman to come over.

740. Are not the facilities of communication between Ireland and Glasgow rapidly increasing?—They are.

741. What is the present rate of a passage from Ireland to Glasgow?—A steerage passage, I believe, they very frequently get for about two or three shillings, from Belfast to Glasgow.

742. Do not they get over for less than that?—Occasionally they may have got over for less.

743. You have stated that the sum necessary to support a family is about 22*l.* a year; is it not consistent with your knowledge, that many heads of families are only receiving 4*s.* 6*d.* or 5*s.* per week?—Much less, often.

744. Then how do they subsist?—By charity, or they partly starve; that is, they pass days without food.

745. What leads you to imagine that a rise in the present wages at Glasgow would not be a temptation to the labouring poor of Ireland to go there?—I do not think that the rise for some time would amount to so much as to enable the persons that came in to live.

746. Are you not aware of the fact, that there are persons wandering over the face of Ireland without any employment, or without any means of honest subsistence?—I believe that a great part of the population of Ireland is unemployed.

747. Consequently any employment at any wages, however low, in Scotland, would be better than their present condition in Ireland?—I do not think if they were in the same situation as the weavers at Glasgow, that their situation would be better than at present; they live in Ireland, and they could do no more, after they had learnt to weave, in Glasgow.

748. You say that the weaver at Glasgow has some employment, and some wages, and you admit that part of the population in Ireland have no employment and no wages; therefore, would not their flowing into Glasgow to receive some employment and some wages, better the condition of that Irish population?—I do not know that it would better their condition, because if in Scotland they cannot get so much as to sustain nature by their wages, seeing that they are sustained by some means or other in Ireland, I think they would not be better off in Scotland than they are in Ireland.

749. Are you aware that in the year 1821 there was a Committee of Management of Emigration in Glasgow?—I am; but I was not in Glasgow in that year.

750. Is it consistent with your knowledge, that in that year that Committee transported to America 1,883 individuals for 5,485*l.* at the rate of 2*l.* 18*s.* per head?—I believe they did.

751. That was prior to the passing of the Passengers Act?—Yes it was.

752. Do you know what became of those 1,883 individuals upon their landing?—I believe the majority of them are still in Canada.

753. Have they any location?—They located themselves.

754. Were they absorbed by the demand for labour in that country upon their landing?—Yes; and Canada had a continual accession of emigrants year by year, till the passing of that impolitic Act.

755. Are you aware what has been the average rate of a passage to America, since the passing of the Passengers Act?—I have heard that it is six or seven pounds, including provisions.

756. If

756. If the Passengers Act were repealed, and the expense of a passage to America thereby diminished, although those destitute individuals whom you represent could not emigrate in that way, have you any doubt that persons in great poverty, but one degree better, and having some small capital, would find means to emigrate themselves?—I believe that many would.

Mr.
W. S. Northcote.
1 March,
1827.

757. And the entire population in this country would be diminished exactly in the same proportion as if those destitute individuals were removed?—I do not say that; because those destitute individuals form an immense mass of the population, and the proportion that would gradually remove would be small compared with them; and during the operation of the removal of those persons, the principle of population would continue to increase the number of the wretched, for as proportion as people become more wretched, the population increases; I mean to say, that when men are reckless and desperate in their character, they do not look for improvement in their social condition, and they take the only enjoyment they have in their power, viz. sexual indulgence—they marry; hence, in the worst parts of Ireland, and in Lancashire, population more rapidly increases than in places where the people are better off.

758. Having considered this subject attentively, can you state that it is your opinion, that applying the remedy of emigration to England or Scotland, and applying no remedy to the surplus population of Ireland, would produce any important national result?—I believe the national result would be momentary; and I believe that emigration would not produce half the advantages which the reduction of many duties would produce, in giving employment to the population. I could instance the fact of one duty, namely, the duty on printed goods, which amounts to about 4d. per square yard; the average price of a piece of printed goods is 8s. per yard, and as those printed goods are purchased very much by servant girls, and people of that sort, to whose expense is an object, there certainly would be a greater quantity sold if that 4d. per square yard were taken off; and I believe that the decrease of duties upon manufactured goods generally would be a greater and a more permanent national good than emigration.

759. But if emigration is to be taken up as a national object, and the means for it supplied by the national funds, do you conceive Scotland, or Ireland, to be the point where the population is most redundant?—I believe that Ireland is the point where the population is most redundant; but I have no hesitation in giving it as my opinion, that Scotland is the point where the emigration ought to commence, for this simple reason, that the Scotch are a people who have been long accustomed to independent habits; that they have never, till recently, been in their present truly wretched condition; that they are not so reckless as the Irish generally are, and that to them it is more acute misery to be dependent on charity, than it is to the Irish; and that the Irish people, from being long habituated to wretchedness, might, in point of charity and good feeling, be suffered rather to remain for some time longer in that condition, than that the Scotch should be suffered to get into the horrid circumstances that the Irish have been so long in.

760. You state, that the great distress in Glasgow and its neighbourhood is among the hand-loom weavers?—It is.

761. Are you not aware that the duty on printed goods is a protection to hand-loom weaving?—I consider no tax to be a protection, as it throws back upon the protected class those whom the prohibition renders destitute.

762. Are you not aware that variegated patterns can be wrought by the hand loom, which cannot be wrought by the power-loom?—Yes.

763. Consequently when a variegated pattern is desired on a web wrought by the power-loom, it must go to the print-field?—I mean to say, that if a person has 4s. in his pocket, who wishes to purchase an article the price of which is 8s. upon which there is a duty of 4s., if that duty were removed, he or she might purchase that article, which otherwise they could not do.

764. Do you not think that emigrants who have friends already located in Canada would greatly prefer being allowed to locate themselves in the neighbourhood of such friends?—I do believe it.

765. Do you not think that such emigrants would greatly prefer that even a *small* amount of expenditure should be incurred in their location, if they were allowed to choose their own sites, than that a greater degree of assistance should be afforded by the State, coupled with the condition of placing themselves where the State might point out?—I do.

Mr.
W. S. Northcote.
1 March,
1847.

766. Do you not believe that in addition to that, the emigrant could locate himself, if allowed to do so in his own way, at a much less sum of money than the State could do it for?—I have already stated, that so far as regards conveying himself to Canada, I think he could; but as I have no personal knowledge of the expenses in Canada, I must bow to the opinion of others in this Committee, who have more knowledge upon the subject.

767. Do you not believe that thousands and tens of thousands of emigrants have in fact located themselves in Canada with the assistance of their friends, upon very small sums of money?—I know that to be the fact.

768. Some perhaps with no money at all?—I do not know that to be the fact.

769. Are you acquainted with the amount of settlement fees required in Canada?—I am not.

770. Nor with the rate at which land is sold?—I understood it was given away.

771. Are the Committee to understand, that if the offer were made to those weavers in Glasgow and its neighbourhood, that they should be taken over and landed in Quebec, and receive no further assistance, that they would prefer accepting that offer, finding their own way to their friends and settling themselves, to receiving assistance upon the principle of a minimum of subsistence being given to them with reference to ultimate repayment?—Certainly not; they are in such a wretched state, that they must have some assistance rendered in Canada by whoever takes them over.

772. You were understood to state, that the friends of those parties are willing to assist in their location; consequently upon an opportunity being given for a communication to their friends, that they were to be landed in Quebec, for example, upon a particular day, do you conceive that those weavers would rather trust to the assistance of their friends, not making themselves responsible for any return of money whatever, or that they would prefer to be settled upon the principle of Mr. Robinson's emigrations in 1823 and 1825?—I have no hesitation in saying that they would prefer some certain assistance.

773. Are you not aware that it has never been contemplated to give any assistance to the emigrants that was not reduced to the least amount that is compatible with the maintenance of the emigrants so settled?—I wish that all objections to emigration may be done away with by proposing the very cheapest plan that can be stated to Parliament; and I think that the plans that have been pursued already by these local societies have been shown to be so exceedingly cheap, and so much below the sum mentioned by Mr. Peel, that I have no hesitation in stating one very great impediment in the way of emigration would be removed, if those plans were adopted.

774. You are understood to have stated in answer to a question put to you, that you think the emigrants themselves would prefer not to receive assistance after their arrival in Canada, but to be placed in the neighbourhood of their friends, and to rely upon the assistance of those friends?—What I meant to say was, that the emigrants, like many other men, would be very glad to be the judges of their own mode of expenditure; as they would have to repay the money advanced to them, they would like to have the hiring of the vessels, and any thing of that sort, in their own committees, or committees of gentlemen whom they know; and probably by that means they would save the repayment of half the money that government would otherwise expend; I mean to say, if government would establish local committees, similar to the committees that have already existed in Glasgow, there is a general feeling that the business would be done at a considerably smaller expense than government would be put to.

775. Do you mean to state, that the details of the location of those emigrants in Canada, and their necessary expenses in that country, would be better managed by a Glasgow committee than they would be by a general Emigration Committee, supposing such were to be appointed?—I have no hesitation in saying that I believe it would be cheaper done by local committees, who are already well acquainted with all the details; there is as much known about Canada by those local committees at Glasgow, as is known by the government.

776. What practical course would you propose?—The practical course I would propose would be simply this, to get some respectable gentlemen in Glasgow voluntarily, without any expense, to give their assistance; there are many respectable gentlemen in Glasgow and its neighbourhood, who would give the most cordial assistance without any expense; they would themselves look after it; they would get the intended emigrants their food, and whatever was necessary for their passage; and

and they would hire vessels near Glasgow at a much cheaper rate, and in a manner much more agreeable to the emigrants, than the emigrants would consider the government could do.

777. What should be done after they land?—After they land, all further assistance should be left to the government.

778. Admitting that their removal from Glasgow were to be effected under the management of local committees, up to the period of their landing in Canada, you are understood distinctly to state, that with respect to the remaining expense, the emigrants would be prepared to trust to the mode of assistance sanctioned by this Committee, or sanctioned by Parliament, that being the lowest that was deemed to be compatible with their welfare?—Most cheerfully.

779. In the event of a subscription being made in aid of the emigration of those persons, do you suppose the persons subscribing would not endeavour to remove the class that they thought was the most useless, out of their neighbourhood?—Of course.

780. You said, that you conceived the power-loom was a source of benefit to the country at large, although it contributed to cause distress in certain local districts; do you suppose that those local districts would consider that it rather devolved upon the country at large, than upon those local districts, to aid the emigration of those persons?—I know that is the general opinion in the west of Scotland; the general opinion is, that if those persons were removed, they ought not to be removed by any further burthen upon the already too-charitable gentlemen of the district, but that they should be removed at the expense of the nation at large.

781. Do you suppose that such persons, so subscribing to assist the emigration, would require, or would expect to have some means provided of preventing an undue accumulation of population, not natives of the country?—I have no hesitation in saying, that as improvement takes place in the condition of labouring men, population will have a check, upon the principles I have already stated, both in Ireland and Scotland.

782. Is there not a great apprehension, if you were to remove that part of the Scotch population who petition for emigration, that their places would be filled instantly to be filled up by Irish, if some steps were not taken to guard against that?—Certainly, such is the general apprehension; but I do not believe it would be the fact, that is to say, instantly.

783. You stated, that at a place which you know, the whole of the weavers would be turned out of their houses by the proprietors, on a certain day; you stated also, that there was no parish fund, out of which the able-bodied persons could be supplied; what would be the consequences to those persons, could they emigrate to other parts of Scotland?—There is no possible mode of relief to which those persons could resort; they could go to no trade in Scotland, for every trade is filled up; and likewise, I understand, every trade in England; the weaver is in that peculiar condition, that he can turn his labour to nothing, except the very lowest offices; they may get a little out-door work; I have seen their hands lacerated exceedingly, by earning sixpence a day at breaking stones.

784. Do you think there is a redundancy of population of native Scotch, or do you think it is owing to the influx of Irish?—I do not think there would be a redundant population in any part of Great Britain, were taxation altered, and restrictions abolished; not even with all the Irish that come into Scotland.

785. Do you think, if the Irish population were removed from Lancashire and Renfrewshire, that there then would not be sufficient employment for the weavers, by allowing them to take the country labour, instead of that Irish population?—I believe that country labour is too much supplied at present, and cannot say whether there would or would not be sufficient.

786. If the Irish were removed, would that destroy the proportion?—I believe if the whole of the Irish were removed, it would certainly destroy the proportion; but I think it would be much more desirable that the Scotch should be removed, inasmuch as many of them have friends in Canada.

[The following Estimate and Statements were delivered in, and read:]

Mr.
W. E. Northcote.
1 March,
1847.

Mr.
W. S. Nottkows.1 March,
1827.

No. 1.

ESTIMATE, showing the Quantity, Price, and different kinds of Articles consumed, or Expense incurred by *employed as a Weaver, and considered as a second-rate workman, when his average wages, during the year 1815, were £. 42. 5. 2. per annum; the lowest rate of wages during the year being 12s. per week, and the highest rate 18s. per week; hours of working, from 14 to 16 hours per day.*

The number of persons in the family were, —		£.	s.	d.
1 Man, whose average wages per annum were	- - - - -	42	5	-
1 Woman, who during the year contributed by her labour to the annual income	- - - - -	5	17	-
3 Children, none of whom were able to contribute anything towards the annual income	- - - - -	—		
TOTAL sum of wages annually received by a Weaver and his Wife		£.	48	2 -

By 5 ells per day weaving, a 1200f Linn Road, at 6½d. per ell, after deducting odd days, being annually	- - - - -	£.	42	5 -
Wife employed at winding yarn, at 3d. per spindle, earning 2½ per week, or annually	- - - - -	5	17	-
		£.	48	2 -

ANNUAL EXPENDITURE.

Articles produced at Home, and consumed in household use.

Quantity.		£.	s.	d.
50 quarters loaves	Wheat Bread - - - - -	9	12	-
104 pecks, at 8½d. per peck	Oatmeal - - - - -	6	18	8
7½ pecks, at 40½d. per peck	Potatoes - - - - -	3	11	6
at 1s. per week	Vegetables of any kind, except Potatoes	9	12	-
50 lb. at 20 os.	Butter - - - - -	3	9	4
410 quarts, at 1d. per quart	Milk - - - - -	1	14	8
1 gallon	British Spirits - - - - -	-	11	-
150 lb.	Butcher Meat - - - - -	4	11	-
50 lb.	Salt - - - - -	-	8	8
8½ gallons	Oil for light (foreign) - - - - -	1	6	-
5 Cwt., at 12 cwt.	Coals - - - - -	9	-	-
30 lb. at 8d.	Soap - - - - -	1	8	-
14 lb.	Soda - - - - -	-	4	4
50 lb.	Starch - - - - -	-	4	4
	Barley, for broth - - - - -	-	13	-
TOTAL Household Expenses more generally connected with Home productions - - -		£.	22	5 6
Colonial Productions:		£.	s.	d.
50 lb.	Sugar - - - - -	1	19	-
½ gallon	Rum - - - - -	-	9	-
5½ lb.	Coffee - - - - -	-	13	-
2 os.	Indigo - - - - -	-	8	8
TOTAL Colonial Productions - - -		£.	3	3 8
Foreign Productions:				
5½ lb.	Tea - - - - -	1	19	-
TOTAL Household Expenses - - -		£.	27	7 8

Household Expenses brought forward -			£.	s.	d.	Mr. W. S. Northmac. 1 March, 1827.
Expense of Clothing -			£.	s.	d.	
Woolen -	-	-	2	-	7	
Cotton (foreign) -	-	-	1	5	6	
Leather -	-	-	1	5	-	
Hats and Haberdashery, not included in the foregoing charges -	-	-	1	8	-	
TOTAL expense of Clothing - £.			6	10	1	
Miscellaneous expenses:						
Tear and wear of furniture -	-	-	-	7	-	
Rent of House -	-	-	5	10	-	
Direct taxes -	-	-	-	4	6	
Water rent -	-	-	-	5	-	
Church Sews, rent -	-	-	-	5	-	
Education for Children -	-	-	-	10	-	
Charges for Medical attendance -	-	-	-	15	-	
TOTAL Miscellaneous Expenses - £.			7	10	6	
TOTAL EXPENDITURE -				52	3	3
TOTAL INCOME -				48	2	-
Difference -			£.	4	1	3

From the above Statement it appears that in 1815 expended £. 4. 12. 3d. more than his income. This he was enabled to do from having something in hand, and also allowing himself to run a little in arrears.

INCOME and EXPENDITURE of said Family in 1826:

	£.	s.	d.
One Man weaving a 15/00 Lows Band, at 2½ d. per ell, 5½ ells per day of 16 hours length, being annually -	15	15	-
A Wife winding yarn as a reduction, earning annually -	3	15	10
Three Children to support, who earn nothing -	-	-	-
TOTAL yearly Income -			10 10 10
Expended for Oatmeal, Potatoes, Salt, and other food -	12	10	-
Lowest expense for wear and tear of weaving materials, and other charges connected with working, at 1½ weekly -	3	5	-
			15 15 -
Leaving for House-rent, Clothing, direct Taxes, Sickness, Births, Burials, Religious and Moral Instruction, &c. &c. &c. -	5	15	10

N. B.—It is impossible to detail the expenditure of 1826, Provisions being procured by trifles, and many more shifts had recourse to, to perpetuate existence.

AVERAGE PRICE of the following Articles during the Years

ARTICLES.	1825:	1826:
Oatmeal, per peck of 8 lb.	£. 1 6	£. 1 0
Barley, per lb.	- 3	- 3
Potatoes, per peck of 4 lb.	- 11	- 12
Beef, per lb. of 20½ oz.	- 7	- 8
Wheat Bread, per quarter loaf	- 11	- 10
Butter, per lb. of 20 oz.	1 4	1 5
Salt, per lb.	- 8½	- 8½
Soup, per lb.	- 10	- 9
Coal, per cart of 12 cwt.	£. 2	£. 6
Sugar, per lb.	- 0	- 0
Tan, per cart	- 5	- 4½
British Spirits, per gallon	12	6 8
Coffee, per lb.	2 6	2 6

Mr.
W. S. Northouse.
1 March,
1817.

Statement, No. 2.

THE following is a List of the WORK of 20 WEAVERS, taken as they were inserted in the Books of a certain Warehouse.

Description of work, Light Males, from a 14th to a 14th Reed.

N ^o of the Week.	1816.		N ^o of Days.	Amount of Earning.			REMARKS.
	From	To		£.	s.	d.	
131	October - 19	November 15	27	1	2	4	By the annexed Statement, it appears that 20 Weavers have earned £. 25. 15 s. in 658 days or 94 weeks, making an average of nearly 6½ pence per week to each.—The Manufacturer from whom books this list is taken, will be pleased if he quired.
132	— 18	— 15	28	1	4	4	
133	— 17	— 15	29	—	17	8	
134	— 16	— 11	26	1	4	4	
135	— 15	— 11	30	1	7	5	
136	— 11	— 4	24	1	2	4	
137	— 10	— 11	39	—	15	3	
138	— 7	— 11	35	1	10	5	
139	— 6	— 1	26	—	13	1	
140	— 6	— 10	35	1	4	4	
141	— 6	October - 28	22	—	17	2	
142	— 6	November 11	26	1	18	2	
143	— 4	— 4	31	1	10	0	
144	— 3	— 10	44	2	—	5	
145	— 3	— 8	36	—	12	1	
146	— 3	— 10	38	—	15	8	
147	— 3	— 11	39	1	10	0	
148	September 30	— 7	28	1	13	0	
149	— 30	— 7	38	1	4	4	
150	— 30	— 11	45	2	7	5	
Total				25	15	—	

Statement, No. 3.

Weaver in Arderton, after being two weeks out of employment, had the good fortune to procure for work a Double Darned Shawl from — on the 21st October, and finished it on the 11th November, 1816, being 4 weeks.

60 Ells, at 5 d. per ell, amounts to	£.	s.	d.
	1	5	—
Deduct for Drawboy's wages, 2½ per week	£.	s.	d.
	—	8	—
Loan sent, Drawing, &c. 1/8 - 4 th	—	6	—
	—	14	—
Leaving him for four weeks subsistence	£.	—	11

Statement, No. 4.

Three Cases—of First, Second and Third-rate Workmen; employed at the best of Light Fancy Work.—Taken from the Warehouse Books.

From 4 May to 10 November 1816, Being 27 weeks—average 6½ weekly	£.	s.	d.
	—	6	—
	1	17	1
	1	16	9
	2	1	2
	2	1	2
	£.	8	8
From 20 July to 15 November 1816, Being 17 weeks—average 4½ weekly	£.	s.	d.
	—	12	—
	1	17	1
	1	8	9
	£.	3	17
From 3 May to 15 November 1816, Being 28 weeks—average 2½	£.	s.	d.
	1	12	6
	1	4	9
	1	13	—
	£.	4	10

Statement, No. 5.

Weaver, residing in Simpson's Lane, Chesapeake-street Anderton, weaves a
10th 3/4 Jacobin a' 1 1/2 d. per ell. Finishes a web of 16 1/2 els long in 4 weeks and 3 days.

16 1/2 Ells, a' 1 1/2 d. per ell, amounts to	-	-	-	-	-	£	s.	d.
						1	3	- 1/2
Deduct for loom rent, dressing, &c.	-	-	-	-	-	£	s.	d.
						-	5	7 1/2
Bearing, 4 1/2 d. Twisting, 6 d.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10 1/2
Oil for light, 6 d. per week	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	3
To support himself, a Wife and two Children	-	-	-	-	-	-	15	3 1/2

As neither wife nor children earn any thing, the whole family must be supported on 2/11 per week, for which sum they can procure—

One peck of inferior Meal	-	-	-	-	-	-	£	s.	d.
							-	1	6
One peck of Potatoes	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Cash, 4 1/2 d. Salt, 1/2 d.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5
						£	-	8	11

works every lawful day from 7 o'clock in the morning till 10 o'clock at night, subsisting upon half a pound of meat and one pound of potatoes.

The above statement can be attested by a number of respectable householders in the neighbourhood.

Statement, No. 6.

COPY of a LETTER from a respectable Agent in the Country, to his Manufacturer.

" Sir,

" ANSWERING to your request by my friend on Friday, I have taken a view of the Wages of 12 ordinary Weavers during 3 months, commencing 10th August and ending 10th November 1826; and to make the Statement as correct as possible, from the various descriptions of work done here (though all are allowed to be nearly alike paid) yet there is a difference in those with mounting, or in other words, fancy lappets, with those lappets that are only plain. I have taken part of each description, and done by 6 married, and 6 unmarried persons, and find the Weekly Average to be only 5s. 6d.

" As I was not satisfied with the above, I took other 12 Hands, 6 of which at plain lappets, and 6 who have veins, twells, &c. and found the Average to be, weekly, only 4s. 9d.; and there were none of the above Apprentices.

(Signed) " Agent."

Statement, No. 7.

in the employ of weaves on 11th heavy Check, in a *frederick* workman, and generally tells 16 hours per day: has 1 1/2 d. per ell, each web 16 1/2 els long; can finish 16 webs in the year. The produce for winding to each web is 4s. 3d.—Has a Wife and 3 Children.

Yearly Income	-	-	-	-	-	£	19	8	-
Rent	-	-	-	-	-	£	3	8	-
Loom expenses, at 1/6 weekly	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	18	-
Police dues	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	6
Read money	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Water money	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-
							7	17	6
Leaving for Subsistence and Clothing	-	-	-	-	-	£	11	10	6

Statement, No. 8.

INCOME and EXPENDITURE of a Family, the Man employed as an Assistant Tenter; Year 1856.

Quantity.	EXPENDITURE.	—	INCOME.	—
78 pecks, s' 1/8	Meal - - - - -	£. s. d.	residing in Gallowgate, is	£. s. d.
78 d ^{rs} - - -	Potatoes, s' 1/2 per peck - - -	6 10 -	employed as an assistant tenter in a power-	
265 quarts - -	Milk, s' 3d. per quart - - -	3 18 -	loom factory; is considered a first rate	
52 quarters -	Wheat Bread, s' 9 1/2 d. per q ^r -	4 11 -	workman in that branch, and receives 10s.	46 - -
16 lbs. s' 8d.	Soap - - - - -	0 1 9	per week as stated wages, and did so during	
	Starch, 1 d. per week - - -	17 4	the year 1856 - Total yearly income -	
	Other washing charges - - -	4 4	His wife, who contributed by her labour 1/6	
24 cart. s' 5/6	Coal - - - - -	19 -	per week, or yearly - - - - -	3 18 -
4 gals. s' 1/6	Oil - - - - -	1 18 6	Income per annum - - - - -	29 18 -
		16 6		
	TOTAL EXPENDITURE			
	for Provisions - - -	38 4 10		
	House-rent and City taxes - - -	4 10 -		
	Interest on furniture valued at	1 - -		
	20 l. at 5 per cent per ann. - - -	1 - -		
	Deduction on wages for inability	1 - -		
	Medicines and medical attend-	1 15 -		
	ance - - - - -	1 15 -		
	Shoes for the family - - -	1 3 -		
	TOTAL - - - £.	39 13 10	EXPENDITURE - - - - - £.	39 13 10
			Difference in favour - - - £.	0 14 10

John Toit and James Wilson, called in; and Examined.

John Toit
and
James Wilson.1 March,
1857.

787. (To Toit.)—WHAT is your employment?—I am a weaver.
 788. The Committee understand that if funds were to be advanced from any quarter for the purpose of your emigration, after the expiration of a certain period of years you would have no objection to bind yourself to pay interest for the money so originally advanced?—None at all, that is what we wish; we wish it as a loan, not as a gratuity.

789. Of course you would be desirous that every expense that could possibly be avoided should be avoided in your location in Canada?—Certainly, because the less expense that is laid out in taking us out, the less there will be to repay, as we look upon it as certain that we must repay it.

790. But at the same time, although you very naturally wish that the expense should be reduced to the lowest possible degree, you do not mean to object to such expense as is necessary to enable you to prosper, by giving you assistance in the earlier period of your emigration?—Certainly; what is useful to us in agricultural implements and subsistence is absolutely necessary for our well-being, because unless we have a good foundation we cannot expect to have success.

791. Supposing you are taken out at the least expense possible, that you are provisioned during your passage there at the least expense compatible with your health, that you are taken to your location at the least expense, that you have implements found for you at as cheap a rate as is consistent with the goodness of them, that you are rationed at as low a rate as is compatible with your health, and that in general you receive only that degree of assistance which is necessary to give you a chance of prospering there; do you feel any objection to pledge yourself, at a future period to repay, or in other words, to pay interest upon the money so advanced to you?—We have no objection to those terms; and indeed the persons that we represent are waiting anxiously for something of the kind, and would be happy to hear that on these conditions they would get some relief.

792. Supposing you had the choice given to you, either to be assisted in forming your settlement at as low a rate of expense as can possibly be incurred, upon the terms of making repayment for the money advanced; or to have no assistance, and to be left to shift for yourselves after your landing in Canada, without being called upon to make any return; which would you prefer?—We would like the first condition

dicion better, that is, of advancing the means as a loan, and that we would repay it.

793. Have you any means of ascertaining to what extent you would be able to make a repayment?—According to the correspondence we have with those that have gone before, and the personal knowledge of some that have recently come home to take away their families in the spring, we have every reason to hope that we will be most successful; indeed most of those that have gone out before were weavers, and they state in their letters, that now they are almost independent; I would name one person, who was not accustomed to out-doors labour, of the name of Carswell; he went out to the township of Ramsey in the year 1821, he has been there since; he said he had eight dollars when he left Greenock to go out on his passage; he was fifteen-pence in debt when he was established upon his land; with the government assistance, and with his own perseverance, he has accumulated a good stock on his ground.

794. What is his stock worth?—I never heard it estimated, but he said he had as much subsistence as would serve him for two years; and he sold as much as carried him home, and to take out his family in the spring; he was single-handed; he had eighteen acres cleared; and he said that had he had a family and been obliged to apply himself more, he would have succeeded far beyond that.

795. How long has he been out?—About six years.

796. If you were not called upon to pay one farthing of interest upon the money applied to your emigration, for seven years, you would feel no doubt of your being perfectly enabled to do it after that time?—None at all.

797. When you say that you have no doubt that you should be perfectly able to repay the money advanced, have you any idea of the amount you should be required to make the repayment of?—We have always roundly stated the expense to be at twenty pounds a head, but this was taken from calculations of the former settlers; from the circumstances of the times, we consider that it may be still less.

798. Supposing it were found that a man and a woman and three children could not be located with advantage, having all that assistance which you express a wish to have an opportunity of receiving, and of ultimately repaying at a less sum than 100*l*, would you feel any objection to bind yourselves at the end of seven years, not paying any thing during that period, to pay 5*l*. per cent on that money, as a return for the money advanced to you in money or in money's worth?—No objection; the only difficulty we see in repaying in money, is the want of a ready market, but if government would take it in grain, it would be very beneficial to us.

799. Supposing that money should not be forthcoming at that time, would you have any objection to bind yourself to repay in grain or produce 5*l*. per cent upon the money so advanced for you?—None at all; we would be happy on such condition to obtain it.

800. Do you think, from the information you have received, that you would be exposed to any thing like inconvenience after the termination of seven years, in paying in grain or in money that amount?—No; as I said before, from our correspondence with those who have gone out, we feel certain that, with proper industry, we would be able to repay it without any difficulty at all; and indeed we consider that in less than twenty years we would be able to redeem the principal.

801. Have you made any inquiries with regard to the demand for labour in the United States?—I know some that have gone out to the United States lately, and they went as tradesmen, to work at their trade; in some places the demand is pretty good, in others it is not so; but the wages of a weaver there are below a common labourer's, and in that case we consider that, with the tide of emigration directed to the United States, we would be obliged to work at our trade, and carry the evil along with us of a multiplication of hands in that trade.

802. Supposing you had your choice, either to incur the debt of 20*l*. a head to be located in Canada, or to have assistance given you to the extent of 5*l*. a head, merely to emigrate and to make the best of your way wherever there was a demand for labour throughout the United States, which would you prefer?—I would prefer the government debt of 20*l*. to repay it, there are a number that are so tired out with commercial life, indeed most of the emigrants are so tired out with commercial life, that they would not, I believe, accept the gift of 5*l*. to go to the United States to follow their own occupation, but in general they would accept the government grant, because they would consider that under government they would be more successful and sure than by taking their chance.

*John Tait
and
James Wilson.*

*1 March,
1827.*

803. Are the weavers aware of the nature of the labour of a new settler?—They are perfectly aware of the great hardships they must encounter in the first two or three years.

804. Do you think they will make good fellers of heavy wood, and that they will be able to stump up roots and clear land?—A good many of them have been accustomed to out-door labour; and during last summer a good number were employed in breaking stones, a species of labour harder than that of felling trees, and if they can exert themselves in one way they will do it in another.

805. From your general knowledge of the feelings of the persons wishing to emigrate, to Glasgow and its neighbourhood, on the whole, are you disposed to think they would rather incur a debt of 20*l.* a head, or take a smaller sum, and be left to shift for themselves throughout the continent of America?—I could take upon myself to say, they would rather accept the 20*l.* a head, than take the 5*l.*

806. You have stated, that several persons have gone from that part of the country to Canada already, as emigrants; what sum of money have they usually carried with them?—I could not answer that.

807. You talked of some government assistance being given to a person that was fifteen-pence in debt upon his arrival at his location; do you know what the nature and extent of that assistance was?—They paid their own passage from Greenock to Montreal; and there were three instalments given them by government, of eight pence a head.

808. In the case of this man that was fifteen-pence in debt when he arrived upon his location, what was the sum that he received from government?—He received eight pounds besides, but when he was located upon his land he was fifteen-pence in debt; but he had one or two instalments from government after that, which enabled him to live.

809. What was the sum total of the assistance he received from government?—Eight pounds, and implements.

810. And any stock?—No.

811. No pig or cow?—Nothing whatever of that kind.

812. No food?—He had five pounds in money after he was located upon his land, to purchase food for the first year.

813. Suppose a manufacturer was going to Canada, he would sell off his furniture and his loom, and what he had in his house; how much do you suppose he could raise in that way?—There was a sale of weavers' implements and household furniture, about two or three weeks ago, in the village of Govan; I think the sequestration cost about two or three pounds, and the money produced by the selling of the articles was 12*l.* A loom, which every weaver must have, and materials along with it, which would cost 5*l.* about three or four years ago, sells now, if put up to sale, sometimes as low as 9*s.* and sometimes at 3*s.*; but they cannot get above 10*s.* in any case.

814. What would he get for the other articles of furniture in his house?—There is not one among fifty that can say the furniture there is their own.

Sabbath, 3^d die Martii, 1827.

Alexander Corliss Buchanan, Esq. called in; and Examined.

*A. C. Buchanan,
Esq.*

*3 March,
1827.*

815. YOU are generally acquainted with the circumstances of the trade in the carrying of passengers between this country and the United States, as well as between this country and Canada?—From Ireland I am perfectly.

816. Have you made any comparison between the expense that will be occasioned by the restraints proposed in this Act, which has been laid before the Committee as a substitution for a former Act, and the expense occasioned by the Act of the year 1825?—I have.

817. What would be the difference of expense between the two Acts?—About 12*l.* 6*s.* for each passenger.

818. What do you consider would be the expense at present?—It is now perhaps 40*l.* for an adult, or 3*l.*

819. From what port to what port?—From Londonderry and Belfast, which are the great ports of emigration to our colonies; to the United States it is about 5*l.* or 6*l.*

820. What would be the expense of the poorest class of passengers from Belfast to Quebec?—About 50*l.*, finding their own provisions.

821. By

821. By this Act, a certain quantity of provisions is necessary?—They are; but the representations were so numerous from the poor people, that the provisions prescribed by the Act were so expensive, that the officers of His Majesty's Customs saw that it would in effect almost prohibit emigration if it were enforced, and they took upon themselves, I believe, to waive that part of the Act.

822. Do you consider that in point of fact, with respect to emigrants going from Ireland generally, the provisions of that Act have virtually been waived?—Not generally; the restriction as to numbers, and a proper supply of water, surgeon, &c. was particularly attended to by the officers of Customs, and although they waived that clause respecting a certain description of provisions, they generally made inquiry into the supply the passengers had.

823. Have you an opportunity of knowing that to be case with respect to the south of Ireland as well as the north?—I have not.

824. Is it your impression that it has been so in the south?—I should think it has been. I dare say I have accompanied 6,000 emigrants to America myself, within the last ten years.

825. In these cases, the provisions of that Act were not enforced?—Not to any great extent; it has been the custom, for the last six or seven years, for the passengers to find their own provisions; formerly the ships found them.

826. Then in point of fact, the passengers themselves took that quantity of provisions which they thought necessary?—They did.

827. Do you imagine that the amount of provisions proposed to be required by this new Act, is greater than what is taken by the poorest of the emigrants who provide for themselves?—I do not think it is near so much.

828. The question applies to the quality as well as the quantity?—I understand it so.

829. Do the emigrants take pork or meat, for instance?—Very seldom; they take a little bacon.

830. Have the provisions which the Act prescribed with respect to tonnage, been actually observed?—They have.

831. The Custom-house officers have uniformly taken care, although they have relaxed with respect to provisions, to have the proportions of passengers to tonnage preserved?—They examine the list of passengers going out, to see that it corresponds with the licence; the licence is granted in proportion to the registered tonnage.

832. Is it the custom after the Custom-house officer has examined the list, that passengers are taken off the coast?—I do not think it is; I have heard of trifling instances of the kind; the price paid for passage to our own colonies is so trifling, that a captain of a ship would hardly take the trouble.

833. Did you ever know it to happen in any vessel which you yourself were on board?—Never; I have repeatedly seen some relanded that have hid away on board; on the captain examining on leaving port, if he found he had any above his number, he would have to, and put them on shore.

834. What practical inconvenience do you anticipate from allowing passengers to take with them such provisions as they may think fit, without any legislative enactment on the subject?—I think that the description of emigrants from Ireland particularly are very ignorant, and they have latterly got such an idea of the quick dispatch to America, that they would take a very short supply; they hear of packets coming over from New York to Liverpool in twenty or twenty-five days, and many of them come into Derry, calculating upon a twenty days passage, and without a quantity of oatmeal and other necessaries in proportion, and they are obliged to provide themselves with a larger quantity before they go on board.

835. Have you ever known any inconvenience actually to arise in consequence of a deficiency of provisions?—I have not known any myself, but formerly I have understood there were very great privations suffered, and a great many lives lost, before the Passengers Act passed.

836. Is that an opinion which you have heard from so many quarters as to leave no doubt in your mind of it being the fact?—I am perfectly satisfied of it.

837. Have you not stated that these legislative regulations have, in point of fact, not been adhered to?—They have not, as regards provisions.

838. But although they were not adhered to, they were not so entirely evaded as not to leave them in considerable operation?—Decidedly not.

839. Supposing a passenger, under the expectation of a quick passage, had brought only half the food which this new Act contemplates, what would have taken place

A. C. Buckton,
Esq.

3 March,
1847.

in that instance; is any inquiry made by the captain of the passenger, as to the quantity of provision he has?—Always.

840. If the quantity of provisions he had brought was manifestly under what was necessary for an average voyage, would not the captain insist on his taking more?—Decidedly, he would not receive him without.

841. With respect to the tonnage, will you state to the Committee the reason why you are of opinion that there is a necessity for requiring the height of five feet six inches between the decks, and for prohibiting all stores from being placed between the decks?—I consider it indispensable in a ship carrying at the rate of one passenger to every two tons, to reserve the entire space between decks for their accommodation, and the deck of the ship not being at least five feet and a half, it would not be proper to have it double berthed; and a ship carrying at the rate of one passenger to every two tons, will require to be double berthed, and to have six persons in each berth.

842. Are the double-decked merchant vessels usually of that height between the decks?—Generally more; there are very few that are not.

843. Then have you any reason to anticipate that ships would be built for the express purpose of carrying out emigrants, which would be of a less height between decks than the ordinary merchant vessels, or that the vessels that would be used for that purpose would probably be old merchant vessels?—Not at all; there are very few ships that trade to America that are not five feet and a half high between decks, and over.

844. Then do you conceive that there is any necessity for any regulation enforcing that which actually exists without any regulation?—The reason of that clause is, that ships carrying one to every five tons would be saved the necessity of any delay in making an application for a licence; they could take their one to five tons, and proceed on their voyage in the ordinary way; whereas if they take in a greater number than that, some restriction should be imposed.

845. Do you imagine that there will be any practical inconvenience in these regulations being enforced, either at the Custom-house at the port from which they go in England, or at the Custom-house at the port at which they land in the colony?—None whatever.

846. Do you consider that any expense would be incurred in consequence of those regulations, which would of necessity add to the expense of the passage?—None whatever.

847. Then you are of opinion, that if those regulations were considered to be necessary, there would be no objection against them upon the ground of any real inconvenience being sustained by the trade in consequence of them?—None whatever; I am satisfied they would be approved of, both by the emigrants and the ship-owners.

848. Do you entertain the opinion, that the parties going out would rather be protected by legislation to the extent proposed, than to have no legislation upon the subject?—I am perfectly satisfied they would.

849. Are the Committee to understand that they object very much to those extreme regulations, which make the expense of the passage beyond their means?—They have a great objection to being obliged to have a particular description of provisions, but that has been latterly dispensed with.

850. Then, in point of fact, has emigration from Ireland been prevented, in consequence of that part of the Act which relates to provisions?—I do not think it has.

851. As you have stated that the restrictions of this Act with respect to provisions have been virtually superseded in practice, it is presumed that emigration from Ireland cannot have been prevented by the operation of this Act?—To a very small extent; perhaps to the amount of 100 a year or 200 a year more at the outside might have gone; the difference can only be about 10 or 12 shillings in the expense. I have heard a great many statements made about the Passengers Act; as to the Act increasing the expense of passage to the United States, and amounting to a prohibition of emigration, I am satisfied that if the Act were repealed the price would not be diminished one farthing, as the American law imposes a greater limitation as to number than the British and other local regulations.

852. Supposing this Act were not to be passed, requiring the emigrant to take with him a certain specified quantity of food for 75 days, do you imagine that the emigrant could in prudence take a less quantity?—I do not think he could, for I have known instances of very fast sailing ships from Liverpool being 75, 80 or 90 days

days going out to New York, and frequent instances occur of ships being 60, 70 and 80 days going to Quebec.

853. You say, that you think the emigrants would not take a less quantity of provisions than that which is prescribed by the Act?—I do not think they would; they generally consult the captain; they tell the captain of the ship what quantity they have got, and if he thinks they have not got enough, they put on board more.

854. That Act provides for a certain quantity of bread, meal and flour; is that the species of provision upon which the lower classes in Ireland live, either entirely or in a great measure?—It is generally their chief support.

855. You are not much acquainted with the south of Ireland?—Not particularly; I consider that oatmeal and potatoes form the principal food of the Irish peasantry generally; I include potatoes when in proper season, say in the spring of the year, very necessary, but in case of bad weather or other casualty, oatmeal, flour or biscuit can only be depended on.

856. You are not aware that in the south of Ireland the peasantry never taste bread from one year's end to another?—I am not aware that they never taste bread, they chiefly live on potatoes; but this Act merely says, that there shall be that quantity of that or any other wholesome food equivalent thereto; I only submit that there should be a certain quantity of something on board, enough to keep them in life for 75 days.

857. If there were no restriction whatever by law as to the food to be taken by the passengers, do not you think that the captain of every ship carrying out passengers would for his own sake take care that no person should be taken on board who had not a proper quantity of provisions?—I think he would, or ought to do.

858. Have not you stated that that is the habit?—They generally inquire what quantity of provisions the passengers have brought; the ship is under a very heavy responsibility; I have known instances where the ship has taken on board a quantity of meal to guard against the possibility of the passengers falling short; I have done so myself, I have taken in a few tons of oatmeal, at the expense of the ship, to prevent any accident.

859. In case of a passenger falling short of provisions, would not the captain have to supply that deficiency?—Perhaps the captain might not have any to spare.

860. Does the captain generally go to sea so short of provisions?—A ship going to sea in the North American trade, if she victuals at home, may take in three or four months provisions, but what would a redundancy of a barrel of biscuit or a barrel of meal be among 300 emigrants.

861. What is the general burthen of those ships that carry 300 persons?—From 300 to 400 tons.

862. How many emigrants, according to the regulations of this Act, would be shipped on board a vessel of 350 tons?—I have put on paper a few observations with respect to the points of difference between the proposed Act and the former Act, which I will read to the Committee. In the first place, the proposed Act permits the ship to carry her full number, say one to two tons register, children in proportion, exclusive of the crew; the former Act included the crew. Secondly, it dispenses with carrying a doctor; the former Act imposed that necessity. Thirdly, it permits the ship carrying cargo, reserving a sufficiency of space, with the whole of the between-decks, for passengers, provisions, water, &c.; the former Act prohibited carrying cargo, or it was so construed by the Irish Board of Customs. Fourthly, it relieves the shipowner and captain from obnoxious and frivolous claims and expenses that never perhaps would be resorted to, but operated in the calculation of a conscientious shipowner, not to permit his ship to embark in such trade. Fifthly, it permits the passenger or emigrant to lay in his own provisions, or to make any contract they think fit with the captain for that purpose, the captain being responsible that a sufficiency of wholesome food for 75 days of some kind is on board for each adult passenger; the former Act obliged the ship to have on board a particular description of provisions, not suited to the habits of emigrants, and of increased expense. And the proposed amended Act gives every protection to the emigrant, at the same time removing many absurd difficulties to the ship, and permits as many passengers to be put on board as could possibly be justified with any due regard to their health and lives. I shall state in my humble opinion how it operates in a pecuniary way: first, a ship 400 tons by the former Act could only carry, deducting crew, about 180 adults; now 200; difference 20, at 40 s. per head, deducting expense of water, &c. 40 l.; secondly, free from expense of doctor, at least 30 l.; thirdly, giving liberty to carry cargo, is at least worth equal to 25 l.;

237.

K

fourthly,

J. C. Bache, Esq.

3 March, 1827.

J. C. Buchanan,
Esq.

3 March,
1837.

fourthly, I consider that dispensing with the obligation that many ships are under, to put salt provisions on board to conform to old Act, although not used equal with other matters, to 25*l*.; making a total of 140*l*., which on two hundred emigrants would be equal to 12*s*. or 14*s*. per adult; and supposing that a ship was taking in emigrants, and that plenty were offering, it would enable the ship to carry them for so much less than under the former Act, and form as much actual gain on the passage as charging so much higher, so that in fact the emigrant gets his passage for so much less, and without any loss to the ship. A ship of four hundred tons has about seventy-five feet in length of space, and twenty-six feet wide between decks; so, to have her doubled birthed, would give you about twenty-six berths aside, or sixty-two in all; and allowing six persons to each berth, would accommodate three hundred and twelve persons, which a ship of four hundred tons is permitted to carry; say two hundred adults, with average proportion of children, would at least make (if not more) the number stated, and with twenty of crew, would give on board altogether 332 persons in a space about 95 feet long, 25 to 26 feet wide, and 51 or 6 feet high.

863. If there were no responsibility imposed upon the captains of vessels, either with respect to provisions or with respect to tonnage, are you apprehensive that captains might be found who would be willing to incur risks from which great evils might occur to the passengers?—I am afraid many instances might occur, and unless some legislative regulation existed, I fear captains and shipbrokers would be found that would cram them into any extent, and great hardship would be likely to follow.

864. Do you know of any serious consequences that did arise previous to the passing of the Passengers Act?—I know instances where passengers were carried a thousand miles from the place they contracted for.

865. You know of cases of great individual hardship and suffering?—I do not know of any myself personally, but I have heard of several, particularly a brig from Dublin a year or two ago; but there are positive instances of a number of lives being lost in foreign vessels going from Germany to Philadelphia, which was the cause of the American Act being passed.

866. In the evidence taken by the Irish Committee in 1824, there is a letter printed, from you, quoting that case which you have just mentioned, of the brig William in Dublin; do you know nothing more of it than what is stated there?—I have heard since that the captain was arrested in Quebec, and, I believe, proceeded against by order of the Irish government; it was a very flagrant case.

867. Was it a case of deficient provisions?—I do not know particularly what the causes were.

868. In what year did the Passengers Act pass, was it not 1823?—I think it was.

869. Are you aware that 10,300 voluntary emigrants in 1823 left Ireland for America?—I do not know the exact number; I could tell, by referring to documents, the number that left Londonderry, which is the great focus of emigration.

870. Are you not aware that in 1824, that is, the year after the Passengers Act passed, the number of 10,300 was reduced to 7,500?—I am not aware particularly, I think it very possible; we can always tell in the season before, in the north of Ireland, whether we are likely to have a large emigration; it depends upon the success that the emigrants met with in the preceding year; they write home letters, and if the season has been favourable, if there has been any great demand for labour, like the Western Canal, that absorbs a great many of them, they send home flattering letters, and they send home money to assist in bringing out their friends.

871. If the fact be as it has been stated, that in the year in which the Passengers Act passed, the number of emigrants was 10,300, and the year immediately after the passing of it, it was reduced to 7,500; would you not be disposed to ascribe some portion of that diminution to the passing of the Passengers Act?—I think there has been more stress laid upon the Passengers Act than is warranted by the fact.

872. Do you not know enough of the labouring classes in Ireland, to know that if a person who had emigrated to Canada, one of Mr. Robinson's settlers for instance, were to write home and speak of his success, without explanation, it might be the means of inducing an emigrant to go without any capital, upon the calculation that he would receive similar assistance?—Decidedly; it would operate very strongly upon them.

873. You have lately been in communication with Lord Dalhousie?—I have; I left Quebec in November last.

874. Lord

874. Lord Dalhousie addressed a letter to the Colonial Department, saying that you were apprized of his views upon the subject of emigration generally; have you, from your own observation, formed any opinion, or have you received information from Lord Dalhousie as to his opinion, of the consequence of emigrants landing in any part of the Canadas without the means of subsisting themselves, and dependent upon employment for their success, after such landing?—I have had the honour of conversing a good deal on this subject with Lord Dalhousie, and I know it to be his lordship's opinion, and in which I decidedly concur, that if any great quantity of emigrants came out without having proper arrangements made for them previous to their landing, and means provided for their location, he should regret it excessively, and it would be the source of great distress to them and inconvenience to the government.

875. Your own knowledge of it will enable you to speak to the fact of emigrants landing, and suffering great distress, from being without any means?—I cannot refer to any particular case; those that I have known, were generally of a superior description, from the north of Ireland, from Tyrone and Fermanagh; they were men generally possessing a little property, and in any thing but a distressed state.

876. Do you know sufficient of the situation of the United States, to know what would be the consequence of a very unlimited body of emigrants without capital, being landed there?—You could not land them there, the laws would prevent it.

877. You do not mean to say there are not every year landed in the ports of the United States, a great number of paupers, emigrants from Ireland and England?—I should think, very few. I should think the great bulk of the emigrants that go to the United States, have friends in America; they generally have some money. I knew an instance last year, that emigrants, perhaps to the extent of five hundred, went from Londonderry to Philadelphia and New York, and I should think out of those, near four hundred of them had their passage paid in America.

878. Do you mean to apply the same observations to Quebec?—No; I should think that there are many in Canada that would send for their friends from Ireland, if they had the means of resitting money to them; but a person living in the Talbot, or other distant townships, has no way of remitting five or seven pounds home.

879. Do you think that the American Passengers Act has had any influence upon the class of emigrants that have gone there?—Decidedly; if there are two ships taking in emigrants at Derry, one taking in for Philadelphia, and the other for Canada, the one will have quite a different class of people from the other; in the American ship, they will be better provided and better clad. I have known owners of ships in New York pay as much as a thousand dollars for the support of pauper emigrants, previous to the American Acts.

880. Is that the case in Philadelphia, and the parts of Chesapeake?—The Passengers Act extends to all the states; but particular states, for instance New York, have local impediments. I do not know that local impediment extends to the Chesapeake; but if they found in Baltimore that there were a great number of pauper emigrants coming in, they would very soon pass a State Act to prevent it.

881. To point of fact, can you state to the Committee that any law of that description exists in any State south of New York?—I cannot tell decidedly.

882. When you represent that difference to exist between the class of emigrants who go to America, and the class that go to Quebec, do you mean to draw the inference, that an extension of the provisions of the American Passengers Act to Quebec would produce a similar effect upon the class of emigrants who would go thither?—If we were to restrict the emigration to Quebec, the more expensive it would be to the free emigrant; of course, the more respectable would be the class of people that would go.

883. It would have the effect, then, of keeping at home the poorest and most destitute class?—I should think it would, decidedly.

884. Of those pauper emigrants that so arrive in the Saint Lawrence from Ireland, do you think any large proportion remain in the country?—There are more remain in the country now than did formerly; I should think last year there might have arrived in Quebec about 9,000 emigrants, and a great portion of those that go to Quebec make it a stepping-stone for going to the western parts of the United States; it is the cheapest route. All those going to the back parts of Pennsylvania; bordering upon Lake Erie, and to Ohio, take the route of Quebec and Montreal, from the great facility of transport.

885. Are you not of opinion that if a great body of pauper emigrants were taken from Ireland to the Saint Lawrence, by far the greater number would be induced,

A. C. Buchanan,
Esq.

3 March,
1847.

A. C. Borden,
Esq.

3 March,
1827.

by various circumstances, to go to the United States, and would not settle in the British Colonies?—I do not think there is so much of that feeling as there was, nor in fact is there that inducement.

886. Do not you think that a demand for labour on public works occurring in the United States, would attract a great number?—It has attracted a great number, but the great Western Canal is nearly finished, and there will be a great number of hands ready to go from that canal, to carry on any new work.

887. Is there not generally a great disposition in the Irish emigrants to go to public works, or to towns and manufactures, rather than to cultivate the soil?—Not where there is a family; if the emigrant is a single man, he goes wherever he can get a day's work, and at public work their pay is generally in cash.

888. Supposing the case of a pauper emigrant landing at Quebec, upon the speculation of going to the Western States without any means, and without any capital, how is he to accomplish it?—If he has any work he will avail himself of that work, but unless there is a demand for his labour, he must remain there and depend upon charity; all those originally that intended going to the States or to Quebec, are provided with money, which is generally sent them by their friends.

889. Do you know a charitable institution existing at Quebec, called the Quebec Emigration Society?—I have heard of it.

890. In the year 1823, of 10,258 emigrants that went out, all those who were destitute were supplied with the immediate necessities of life by that society, at the charge of 550 *l.*?—I should think that merely referred to those that loitered there during the winter, just the mere offal of the emigration.

891. You have stated, that Lord Dalhousie has complained of many of the emigrants having arrived in a bad state; do you understand that many of those persons who were in that state, have been persons who had friends in that country, and who had been induced by the representations of their friends to come out?—Those that have gone out to their friends have generally had money remitted by their friends in America, or arrangements made to carry them out; for instance, a person who has gone out to New York or to Upper Canada, writes to his friend in Ireland to come out to him, and if he thinks he has not the means of coming out, he either sends him money, or makes some arrangement at his place of landing to assist him.

892. Does a great proportion of the emigrants consist of persons of that class?—The greater proportion that go from the part of the country that I am acquainted with, are people in general of some property, and who have friends before them.

893. Is not the proportion of persons that are landed at Quebec in a state of destitution, very small?—Very small, from the reason I have stated; in fact we cannot call the emigrants that pass through Quebec a pauper emigration.

894. If the governor in Canada had the power of making a small advance, to the extent of 20*s.* or 25*s.* to each person well disposed to work, to carry him up the country, do you suppose that a relief to that extent might remove the pressing scenes of distress to which you allude?—It might with the present extent of emigration, but if it were to go to any large extent, the thing would be quite impossible, and great distress would ensue.

895. Do you consider that the class of persons who loiter about the town of Quebec taking any casual employment they can get, are generally a very improvident class of emigrants?—It is generally the worst class of emigrants that loiter about the towns.

896. Do you not think that if that worst class of emigrants were taken up the country and located and assisted, they would become steady and industrious persons?—No doubt if they were taken up the country immediately after they were landed, they would become valuable settlers.

897. Does much inconvenience arise from many of the settlers arriving at the bad season of the year?—They seldom arrive in a bad season, they generally arrive in May, June and July.

898. Would there not always be a certain number, of any mass of poor emigrants that would go out, that would remain in a destitute state about the port at which they disembarked, whatever might be the encouragement that might exist for their settlement in the interior of the country?—I do not think that they would to any extent, for during the passage they make up a kind of friendship and a kind of intimacy, so that they rarely wish to separate; I have seen instances of persons going out, whose views of settlement were totally different on going on board,

who

who in the course of their voyage amalgamated, and all went together, upon their landing.

899. Is there not a certain refuse of indolent or incapable persons who are not able to provide for themselves, and who always hang about the ship port at which they land?—A great number; I have seen people that were very opposite to industry at home, become at once, from necessity, very industrious there; I have seen lounging drunken characters in Ireland, gladly sit down to break stones in Canada.

900. Keeping in view that there must always be a great number of helpless persons out of a large body of emigrants, what number of emigrants do you suppose could be passed in the course of a year through Quebec into Upper Canada, without serious inconvenience to the town of Quebec itself?—I should think if there was any proper arrangement made for their reception, there could be no inconvenience whatever; they need not land in Quebec at all, they could send any number of people up the St. Lawrence without having any intercourse with Quebec at all.

901. You stated, that the emigrants you have spoken of have generally some little property; with respect to those that go out with families, what amount of property do they take with them, upon an average?—I should think those that emigrate from Derry with families will have from 30*l.* to 50*l.* upon an average; I have known families have five hundred pounds.

902. Do they take it out generally in money?—Generally in specie.

903. You have spoken of a law in the United States prohibiting the landing of poor emigrants; even if that law were not evaded, is not any man depositing three dollars, though he should be possessed of nothing else, entitled to land under the provisions of that law?—As the law at present stands, he is; but I presume, if there was any increase of pauper emigrants, the mayor and corporation of New York would soon increase the amount required.

904. Are you aware that any poor persons are in the habit of making an agreement to repay the passage money by an engagement for their labour after their landing?—That was the case to a very small extent some years ago in the north of Ireland, especially in the case of servants, but it is entirely done away with.

905. Do you think it is at all the practice at present?—I believe not in the north of Ireland.

906. Are you able to say whether it is the case in any other part of Ireland?—I think not.

907. Do you conceive that captains very often break their engagements with poor emigrants, as to the ports at which they are to be landed?—I have known instances of passengers being landed at St. John's in New Brunswick, who had engaged their passage for Philadelphia.

Martin, 6th die Martii, 1827.

William Bowenius Felton, Esq. called in; and Examined.

908. YOU were examined before the Committee of this House which sat upon the subject of Emigration in last year?—I was.

909. The Committee understand that you have been in Canada since, and that you took out with you the Report of that Committee, and the evidence annexed to it, so as to have an opportunity of informing yourself with respect to all the details mentioned in that evidence, during the course of the last winter?—I have had opportunities of verifying many of the facts detailed in that evidence, and I have had occasion, not only from what I have seen in Lower Canada, but in the adjoining parts of the United States, to be confirmed in my opinion of the ability of a poor settler, possessing health and industry, to purchase wild lands, pay for them with facility, and accumulate property in the course of a very few years.

910. Are you aware that the part of the subject of emigration upon which it is perhaps most necessary to obtain accurate and conclusive information, is that which relates to the progressive success of the emigrant, involving the question of his entire capacity or probable inability, at the termination of the seventh year of his location, to pay five per cent interest, redeemable at any time at his own option by a payment of the principal of 100*l.* or any less sum which may have been advanced to him, for the expenses of his emigration?—I am perfectly aware that some doubts are entertained upon that subject on this side the Atlantic; but I am also equally aware that there are no doubts whatever entertained

A. C. Buchanan, Esq.

3 March, 1827.

W. B. Felton, Esq.

6 March, 1827.

W. B. Paken,
Esq.
5 March,
1857.

tasted upon the subject on the other side of the Atlantic, by practical men intimately acquainted with the interior of the province.

911. If an emigrant, being an able-bodied man, and landing with a wife and three children, be removed from the place of his landing to the place of his location, located on a lot of 100 acres of average good land, provided with assistance in building a log-house, furnished with necessary implements, placed under a qualified degree of superintendence, and rationed for a year or sixteen months, do you believe that he would, at the expiration of seven years from the time of his location, be enabled to execute the terms stated in the last query, without any sort of difficulty or inconvenience?—To judge of the future by the past and by my own experience, I should say there is not room for the smallest doubt as to the capability of the settler not only to pay interest, to commence at the expiration of seven years, but of his being able in the majority of cases to pay the principal in the course of that time, if he thinks proper to do so. I have sold a great deal of land in the province of Lower Canada to Irish and English settlers, at the rate of from three-quarters of a dollar up to two dollars per acre; the description of persons to whom I have made those sales was perhaps not the best calculated to derive the greatest or the speediest returns from the land purchased, but, notwithstanding, I have never yet experienced any difficulty in collecting the interest of the capital from those men, at the expiration of the second, third and fourth year, and in the majority of cases before the expiration of the third year I have received part of the principal in payment; it is true that all those payments have been made in produce of the soil, in stock or grain, but they were equivalent to money or money's worth, and if not absolutely paid in cash, if a reduction be made of about 20 per cent, it would exhibit what would be actually a cash payment; but I conceive that none of the settlers to whom I have sold lands commenced their operations under circumstances so favourable to them as those predicated upon in the question proposed; in the majority of cases which have fallen under my experience, the settlers who commenced their operations were burthened with a debt, in many cases amounting to twenty pounds a family, and they have not only been able to make the payments of interest agreed upon with me, but generally to clear the debt which they had incurred, in the course of the first three years; this debt had been incurred for the purchase of provision and implements to enable them to commence their operations. I am so convinced of the great facility which settlers enjoying the advantages proposed to be afforded to them, possess, to make their payments in the terms prescribed, that I should have no hesitation whatever in binding myself to the extent of 10,000*l.* to make up any deficiency in the payment of the first year's interest, in either of the two provinces, provided that a proper degree of judgment be exhibited in the location of the settlers on the land.

912. In the cases in which you mentioned yourself to have sold land, had the settlers any capital to begin with themselves?—None whatever; in the majority of cases they borrowed provision and implements from the neighbouring storekeeper, to enable them to commence their operations, expecting to pay the amount of those advances in the produce of their industry, in the shape of ashes or provision, in the course of the next two or three years.

913. Was the land which you sold to them wholly uncleared?—Perfectly in a state of wilderness; and in the majority of cases not even on a road.

914. You mentioned there being a debt of twenty pounds for each family in several cases; is that the twenty pounds upon which you say they were able to pay interest exclusive of the interest which they owed to you?—The debt of 20*l.* to which I alluded, was incurred for the purchase of provision and implements, and therefore was a debt owing to a storekeeper, or a dealer in those articles, in which I have no concern directly or indirectly, and upon which they paid him interest till the principal was returned.

915. Can you then state distinctly to the Committee what was the amount of interest which each family was able to pay and actually did pay after two or three years, beginning with no funds whatever?—In order not to mislead the Committee as to the exact description of the parties who have fallen under my observation, it is necessary to say that the majority of them had passed from twelve to fifteen months in the province, working as labourers, and therefore they had acquired some experience of the mode of proceeding that was most advantageous for clearing up waste lands; but in very few instances had they any accumulation of capital, on the contrary, in the majority of instances, they were obliged to borrow provision, as I before stated, to enable them to commence their operations; and that

H. B. Folke,
Esq.
6 March,
1827.

that advance of provision and tools was always made to them on the faith of their previous good character, obtained during a residence for the preceding twelve months in the township, and upon which was founded the assurance of their inclination as well as ability to make the repayment. As to the extent of the interest which they had annually to pay, I should say that in nine cases out of ten they paid more than the interest upon the twenty pounds and the interest upon the twenty-five pounds purchase of land, in the shape of an instalment to the storekeeper; I mean that they paid not only the interest upon the 20*l.* but upon the 25*l.* also, and generally something more in return for the instalment.

916. Then the whole amount of interest that they paid was the interest upon the sum of 45*l.* to 50*l.* advanced to them at setting out, and this they were able to pay at the end of two or three years?—That has been the case in the most unfavourable instances which have fallen under my observation.

917. Is it upon those grounds that you calculate the ability of settlers sent out by government, at the expiration of seven years to commence paying interest upon the sum of 100*l.* similarly advanced?—Not solely upon those grounds, but from what I have had occasion to observe in other parts of the province, where men newly arrived in the province, without any previous character to entitle them to an advance, and without any advance or loan, have purchased land at the same rates, and where, at the expiration of three years, they have been able to commence a repayment of the principal or of the capital. It is necessary for the Committee to understand that in all those cases those operations took place in a partially settled country, whereas the settlers established under the patronage of government have been sent into a wilderness. Now, although the land occupied by the settlers to whom I first alluded was itself a wilderness, yet, relative to the adjoining country, it was more favourably circumstanced than the lands which must necessarily be occupied by any emigration carried on on an extensive scale by the government.

918. For what reason do you consider the emigrants sent out by government to be, as respects repayment, in a more favourable situation than those to whom you have alluded?—Because I conceive that the very circumstance of their being placed in a body will give a facility to all their operations, which an individual, even settling in a partially settled country, upon a wild lot, does not enjoy; and that one year's or sixteen months provision being furnished to them upon the spot where their labour is required, is in point of worth equivalent to double its value, to the settler establishing himself in a partially settled country, who must necessarily lose a great deal of time, not only in seeking his provision if he has to purchase it, but most frequently in labouring for it at a distance from his home.

919. Might not those two advantages be united?—It is impossible; the Crown does not possess land which they can control for the purposes of emigration, in a partially settled country.

920. Are not those lands which have formerly been granted, subject to the condition that they shall be leased out?—As far as respects the Lower Province, the most fertile portion of it, lying south of the river St. Lawrence, and covering a surface of about 3,000,000 of acres, is completely locked up from application to any useful purpose, in consequence of having been long since granted to persons who have not performed, or have very partially performed, the settling duties required of them in their patents.

921. Are you so satisfied of the ability of the emigrant to make such payment, that if individuals were prepared to advance money upon such security, you would feel yourself justified in recommending them to do it?—I have already replied to the substance of that question in an answer I previously gave, but I feel myself perfectly justified in saying, that I should have no objection whatever to recommend an investment of capital to any extent upon so secured a transaction; and I think the greater the scale on which the operation is conducted, the greater probability is there of success attending it.

922. Do you feel so certain upon that point as to be prepared to recommend persons in England to advance capital in that manner, taking the land as a security?—I do certainly, for this reason, if the emigration be conducted upon just principles and upon a scale sufficiently large, one of the immediate effects of the location of a large body of men in a particular district is a rise in the value of the land, not only which they occupy, but which surrounds them on every side; now, this takes place independent of the wish even of the settler who is employed upon the land; and therefore, even allowing that one-third of the settlers fail in fulfilling their engagements, yet I am persuaded that that disposable third will always sell, in

W. B. Filton,
Esq.

6 March,
1827.

a period short of the seven or nine years, for more than sufficient to cover all advances made on account of it, even without any improvements made upon it; but if any improvements are made upon the land, they will of course give an additional value to it, to the extent of those improvements. But I wish to make it intelligible to the Committee, that I am perfectly convinced that the mere rise in the value of the land, which will then become a saleable commodity, will of itself afford them sufficient assurance of their capital being returned to them.

923. Supposing these terms of payment to be perfectly understood by the emigrant, and consented to by him under his signature or mark attached to a printed agreement embodying those terms, do you consider that there would be any difficulty in inducing him to pay, or in levying the amount of such payment?—It is fair to apprise the Committee, that the claims which the government have upon the subject of the provinces for lands, quit-rents and so forth, have been urged with so little importunity of late years, that it has given rise to a suspicion on the part of many people, that it is impracticable for government to collect any thing from the people; now I am perfectly of opinion, that if the settlers are given to understand that this is a matter of contract between them and the government, and that in consideration of their being carried from a given place and put down on a spot convenient for their establishment, and, in addition to that, furnished with a certain quantity of provision and so forth, and an hundred acres of land, the whole of that being considered as an advance made to them, and of course assuming the shape of a debt, that there will not be the smallest repugnance to their acknowledging it as a debt, and engaging to pay interest upon it; I conceive that the carriage out, the provision furnished them, and the land together, should be taken as one debt, that there should be no distinction, the whole of the debt should be considered as a debt due for the purchase of land, and in that view there would be no repugnance to the payment of interest, because it is a usual transaction in that country, and although those people should leave Europe under other impressions, still on their arrival in the province they will find that those transactions are so common that they will lose any childish they might have to them previous to their embarkation; the phrase *rent or quit-rent* may judiciously be lost sight of in this transaction, for though it is in itself unimportant, yet it carries with it an impression rather at variance with the easy collection of this debt.

924. You are aware that lately regulations have been made by government in which the principle of quit-rent has been adopted as the principle of the sale of land, very much upon the principle that is proposed to be taken with respect to these settlers, the arrangement being, that in the wilderness land the settler should have seven years free, and then be required to pay five per cent interest upon the calculated value of the land as wild land, at the time of his settlement; in that case of course he is not called upon to pay five per cent interest upon any thing except upon the mere value of the land, because, by the terms of the arrangement, he is prepared with capital to do justice to that land; having stated that as the law at present in Lower Canada, are the Committee to understand that you think it will be impracticable to collect a quit-rent upon that principle?—Quite the reverse; the very circumstance of making these quit-rents redeemable, alters their character altogether, they are no longer considered as quit-rents, they are in fact interest for the purchase money of the land. There is another point that should be considered by the Committee, that is, that it is judicious to make the settler upon the land feel that he purchases the land, and gives something for it; for I have had occasion, from many years experience, to find out, that an European upon his arrival in the country is very much in the habit of slighting any thing that he acquires easily; and if a lot of good land be offered to him for nothing, the probability is, he will purchase the adjoining lot, though not of superior quality, supposing there must be some reason for the price attached to it; and I therefore am of opinion that in all cases the government should insist upon receiving for its land something equivalent to its actual worth in the market.

925. Had you an opportunity, when in Canada, of ascertaining the opinion of many persons there, who were competent to give an opinion upon the subject upon which you have been examined to-day, and who were aware of the nature of the evidence given by colonial witnesses before the Emigration Committee of last year?—I apprehend that, in the absence of facts and experience, the opinions of the most respectable people in Lower Canada are yet aloof as to this subject; my opinion is founded upon my own observation, an observation which very few of the respectable part of the community in Lower Canada have an opportunity of enjoying

enjoying, not being resident, nor in the habit of penetrating into the interior of the province.

926. Is not the general success of an emigrant under those circumstances a fact quite notorious in Lower Canada?—It is perfectly well known; there is a general impression prevalent in Lower Canada, that the majority of those settlers will go over to the States; but those who are better acquainted with the interior of the province are aware that that consequence will not follow from the establishment of those settlers upon good land, and with the assistance that is proposed to be given to them; the general impression is, that they will go over to the States, where they can get so much higher wages than they can expect, after their twelve or fifteen months probation in the province have expired; but this impression is founded upon no facts, it is founded upon assumptions which have yet to be verified.

927. Do you think that one hundred acres of land, part of it cleared, having a log-house built upon it, and roads made to it, and situated in the midst of a new population, would be ample security for such interest, and ultimately for the principal?—I have already given a decided opinion in favour of that.

928. Do you think the security so good that money could be raised either in Canada or in the United States upon such a security offered?—No money could be raised in Canada, because there is no capital there disposable; as to the United States, I have no doubt that under certain circumstances money could be raised upon that security, provided the faith of the British government were pledged for the due execution of all the terms of the contract.

929. When you say it could be raised under certain circumstances, do you mean that to apply to the faith of the government being pledged, or to any thing else?—The faith of the government being pledged to the extent as to which emigration is to be carried, and to the judgment which should be exercised in its direction, for those are circumstances which the capitalist would take into consideration previous to advancing his money.

930. Those are circumstances however which you must have taken into consideration, when you say that you could recommend persons in England to lend money upon the faith of that security?—I assume those circumstances; I assume that the government will be governed by a sound judgment in the direction of this emigration, and that it will be continuous for at least eight or ten years.

931. What are the peculiar circumstances which you assume as necessary to warrant a capitalist in advancing his money?—I assume that the government shall carry on the emigration to a given extent or for a given number of years, sufficient to cover the whole surface of the district intended to be occupied with settlers, as far as the quality of the soil will permit their location. By a given district, I assume such a portion of the surface of the country as, being in communication with water carriage, shall enable the settlers at some future time to carry their surplus produce to one of the great markets of the province, and of sufficient extent to justify the provincial legislatures in affording them the protection which every other district or county enjoys; I mean that they shall be settled in so great masses, as to enable them at some future period to have the power of making their own road laws and other internal regulations, according to the mode which is followed in other parts of the province; that may generally include a surface of ten or twelve townships, each township being eight or nine miles square, the whole containing about three thousand lots, upon which about six thousand families may be located; as I conceive that, under those circumstances, a population so established will in the course of a few years flourish without extrinsic aid, and possess the power of taking their produce to market, so as to meet competitors on equal terms. The next item in the terms is, the judicious selection of this district for establishment, for it is but fair to let the Committee understand that there are parts of the province which may be established with advantage to the country at large, without being so beneficial either to the settler, or to the person who is to expect repayment of his capital by the exertions of the settler; there are many parts, for example, of the Upper Province, where the wet or swampy lands cover a superficies equal to four or five townships together; now in those situations, although the land will, by the application of a certain capital and in a certain number of years, become exceedingly fruitful and valuable, yet the certain and absolute return will neither be so speedy nor so great as to justify the advance of capital as a mere pecuniary speculation upon its improvement.

932. You are understood to say, that it is your opinion that 100 acres, in

W. S. Feltus,
Esq.

6 March,
1837.

order to be accepted as a sufficient security by an American lending the sum of money required upon it, must possess these two qualifications, it must have a water communication to a market, and it must be situated within a population of a given density?—Those two qualities will make the estate sufficiently valuable to justify any man's advance of capital upon it; but as far as an American is concerned, I conceive that the spirit of my first answer, properly interpreted, means to say, that you shall also make him secure that this property shall be available at any future time.

933. Then what additional qualification would be required to make this a sufficient security for a loan of money by an American or any other foreigner?—The difficulty with respect to a foreigner is, that you can give him no security that the property shall be available in case of hostilities.

934. Would a citizen of the United States require security as an alien; that is, would he require security for the repayment, or would he require security that he should be able to put the laws in force for the recovery of his debt?—He would require both.

935. If an emigrant settler now doing well in Canada, were to be asked his opinion upon the two following points, viz. First, Whether he would recommend an Irish pauper without employ and without hopes of employ, now residing wretchedly in Ireland, with a wife and three children, to come over to Canada and be planted upon one hundred acres, and to make himself liable to the payment of such interest, commencing at the expiration of seven years, such payment to be made in kind, if money be not forthcoming, the emigrant not having the fee-simple of such property until the debt of his emigration was discharged; or, Secondly, Whether he would recommend him on the contrary, in case of free conveyance being afforded to him, to land without any capital being lent to him, and consequently without any pledge of repayment, and to trust for employment to such demand for his labour as might exist at the time of his landing;—in the event of these two questions being put to the prosperous settler now in Canada, clearly comprehending their import, do you suppose that he would recommend the acceptance of such assistance, involving such ultimate payment by interest redeemable at will, or the contrary proposition?—I am quite certain, from my experience and observation, that in all cases the recommendation would be given to prefer the assistance of government, supposing the party circumstanced precisely as is stated in the question; for if there be a slight variation, it will perhaps occasion a very great diversity of opinion; if, for example, a man at this moment in utter distress in Ireland, is master of a certain art or profession, which is known to yield high wages in Canada, his friends, unacquainted with the circumstances of the country, would prefer recommending him to place himself at the spot where his labour could be so beneficially employed, in preference to hindering himself to perform any certain duties for the sake of 100 acres of land, because there are few artificers in active employment in either of the provinces who do not acquire the means of purchasing land in a situation which is more agreeable to them than that which would probably be afforded by government for locations, by the accumulation of his wages in the course of three or four years.

936. The Committee are then to infer from your answer, that in the case of purely agricultural settlers, not capable of following any pursuit other than agriculture, that recommendation would be given; but in the case of a superior class of settlers, who are capable of undertaking other trades or pursuits, it might be doubtful?—I am of opinion that in the case of agricultural settlers, even supposing them to be much better circumstanced than the parties described in the question, the recommendation would be to take the government assistance. At this moment, I have remittances from nine families of Irish settlers, to convey to their friends in Ireland; but I have a request at the same time from those families, in the event of government sending out settlers on any terms whatever, to retain the money for the benefit of the remitters, and to use my influence to have those people embarked under the protection of government. The persons making those remittances are men who commenced, from four to seven years since, with absolutely nothing but their clothing and habits of labour, and who now remit 15*l.* each for the conveyance of relatives in Ireland, none of whom are stated by them to be in distress; therefore, I consider that a superior class of persons to those described in the question would in all cases be advised to accept the assistance of government, afforded them in the manner proposed.

937. The exception, then, that you wish to make rather applies to the case of artisans?

artisans?—To the case of artisans alone, and those being perfect in their respective trades.

933. Might it not be easily arranged, in a system of emigration, that any artisan so emigrating without any capital, might repay the expense of his passage by some arrangement to be made in the way of binding himself apprentice for a certain time?—I apprehend that will only burden the agents with unnecessary details in the conduct of the operation; we find no practical difficulty from want of artisans in the country.

939. Supposing that under the most successful plan you can suggest for emigration, 6,000 families were sent by the government to a particular district, such as you have described in Canada for location, and located there, at what expense do you calculate that the interest of the money upon the loans proposed to be made to them might be collected; and in the event of the payment being made in kind, what arrangements could be devised for the collection of such payment?—I am afraid that any opinion I should give the Committee upon that subject, not being grounded on experience, would be little satisfactory; I do not profess myself competent even to judge of the difficulties that will arise hereafter, but I apprehend that they will not be great; and judging from the expense attending the collection of the seigniorial dues in Lower Canada, I should conceive they would not exceed fifteen per cent upon the gross sum. The Committee must understand that all wages of labour in those provinces are high, and that a merchant even, in acting as a commission merchant, takes in the Canadas five per cent for performing what in other countries is done for two and a half. Therefore, if the collection of a territorial revenue in any country in Europe can be made for seven and a half per cent, it will certainly require twice as much in Canada.

940. In the case that is supposed, namely, that you have a collection to make, from six thousand separate families, of a sum of 1,800 *l.* per annum, at what expense do you consider that that sum might be regularly collected?—I have no experience to direct me, except that which I derive from the collection of seigniorial dues in Lower Canada, and the result of that I have already mentioned; any other opinion will be perfectly gratuitous, having no certain data to go upon.

941. Are the seigniorial dues in Lower Canada collected chiefly in kind?—About two thirds are collected in kind, the rest in money.

942. Are they collected in kind although stipulated for in money, or are they stipulated for in kind?—They are stipulated for in kind and in money.

943. Is it common to receive in kind compensation for those which are stipulated for in money?—Never; on the contrary, it is frequently the practice to receive money in lieu of the payment in kind.

944. With a deduction of a per centage?—Without any deduction to the tenant.

945. Are not the great bulk of lands in Lower Canada so held?—The great bulk of the cultivated land in Lower Canada is held in seigneurie.

946. Are you able to state the proportion of expense which is to be deducted from the amount of those seigniorial dues, for the collection of them?—Not with accuracy; it varies exceedingly, according to the fertility of the seigneurie in which the collection is made; in a rich seigneurie there is no difficulty in making the collection, in a poor one there is a great deal, and therefore the expense is considerably increased.

947. In the case of an emigration upon an extended scale, in which a large district were colonized at once, the communications carried on through that district, and the settlers placed at a reasonable distance from each other, do you not imagine that the expense of such a collection would be much less than it would be with respect to a more desultory and scattered emigration?—Unquestionably it would.

948. How would you estimate the difficulties of collection in the case just put, as compared with the old settled seigneuries in Lower Canada?—I think the difficulty of collection would be less, and for this reason, that it is proposed that the interest should be made payable in produce, and determinable whenever the individual thinks proper to pay the principal; now this holds not so flattering a prospect of becoming perfectly an absolute master of his property, that it is a moral stimulus to keep the tenant attentive to his annual payments.

949. Are there at present in Upper Canada any considerable number of settlers holding their lands upon that principle?—I apprehend not; I am not much acquainted with Upper Canada, but I apprehend there are very few lands held on the payment of rent whatever.

W. B. Follen,
Esq.

6 March,
1827.

W. A. Feltus,
Esq.

8 March,
1897.

950. When you say there are very few lands held on the payment of rent, do you mean to say that there are few lands held upon the settler having given his bond for the payment of the principal?—The majority of the lands that have been purchased or acquired by purchase in Upper Canada are held liable to the payment of the principal and interest, but the bond is not given by the purchaser; on the contrary, the original proprietor retains the title to the land, giving a bond to the purchaser to furnish him with a deed whenever the purchase-money be totally paid up.

951. That agreement is founded upon the system of the purchaser paying interest until he redeems the principal; do you know whether that interest is generally regularly paid?—I have not sufficient personal acquaintance with the Upper Province to answer the question with the precision I ought to do; but in the Lower Province I can answer for it being so.

952. In answer to a former question, you said that the general opinion in Canada was, that after sixteen months probation, as you termed it, the demand in the United States would carry the settlers there; what is the nature of the demand you there alluded to?—I state the opinion as existing, I do not pretend to give reasons for it.

953. What is the nature of the demand that you alluded to?—Employment in working the canals and other great public works.

954. Although labourers from England and Ireland may from time to time find advantageous employment immediately upon landing in the Canadas without money or capital, and ultimately become prosperous settlers, must not that employment depend upon the demand existing at the moment for the services of such labourers; and if the supply of labour were too great, would not that employment be out of the question?—There can be no doubt that for two or three years there will be great difficulty in finding employment for a very extensive voluntary emigration; by extensive voluntary emigration I mean from fifty to sixty thousand souls per annum; we know that the ordinary emigration, which has usually amounted to ten thousand souls, has found very little difficulty in placing itself, whether in the Canadas or in the United States is a matter of indifference, but it has found very little difficulty in placing itself. Latterly, it is true that on their first landing some little inconvenience has been experienced at Quebec, from the sick and destitute who formed a part of the emigration, and inconvenience has also been experienced during the winter season from a large portion of those who have found employment during the summer being thrown out of work; but as both those evils are necessarily limited, one by the demand during summer, which can only employ a certain number of men at Quebec, and consequently can only leave that number of men to be thrown out of employment at the commencement of winter, and the other, although not limited, yet relieved by the arrangements made under public authority for the reception of the sick in the Emigrant Hospital at Quebec, I do not conceive that any inconvenience will be felt by the continuance of an emigration not exceeding the ordinary average of the last five or six years; but if, as I before said, it were increased indefinitely without public assistance, then unquestionably there would, for the first three or four years, be great distress; but I firmly believe that if fifty thousand souls could be continuously introduced annually, in the course of three or four years they would contrive to place themselves either in the provinces or in the adjoining United States, but always with some distress for the first two or three years, and it would be a dangerous experiment to try, without some preparatory measures of relief.

955. Do you think the distress would cease after the first three or four years?—I have no doubt it would, because we found, when 10,000 arrived, for the first two or three years great distress; but those 10,000 have scattered themselves over the province and over the United States, and they furnish places of refuge, if it may be so termed, to the in-coming population; at the same time I am firmly persuaded that very great distress would be found for the first two or three years, perhaps so much so as hardly to justify the direction of so great an emigrant population to any given province, without taking some preparatory steps for their reception.

956. Have not the government works that are going on in Quebec and other parts of the province of Canada, operated as a great temporary relief to the emigrants, by giving them employment?—It has unquestionably had that effect; but the employment at Quebec being only during the summer, has perhaps contributed

contributed to increase the number who were left destitute on the approach of winter.

W. B. Folger,
Esq.

6 March,
1827.

957. With how small a sum would an emigrant coming out to Quebec be enabled to settle himself, without being subject to that great distress you have described?—If I am to take this question in combination with the previous questions, and to suppose that the number of settlers that come out is to be unlimited, I should say he will require a very large sum to place himself advantageously, certainly 15*l*. a head for each of his family; but if the number of settlers is to be limited to the annual average of the last few years, then as his labour will be in demand, he requires a very small advance to gain his bread and subsistence; but to establish himself as a farmer, he requires at least twenty or thirty pounds for himself and his family.

958. Does he require as much as twenty or thirty pounds a head?—Certainly not; the terms of the proposition assume that he gains full employment as a labouring man during the progress of his establishment.

959. The question contemplates a man arriving at Quebec and not looking to obtaining employment; what is the smallest sum with which he could establish himself advantageously?—To state the precise sum which would enable a settler to establish himself according to the question proposed, would deceive the Committee, because the facility of establishing himself in this manner will necessarily be governed by the number of settlers arriving at the same time; and therefore the question applied to a single settler, supposing only one settler arrives in a year, would be answered in a very different way to what it would be if 60,000 settlers arrived in a year.

960. Supposing that reasonable number to arrive which you think could be so settled without material inconvenience?—I have already stated, that supposing the ordinary annual average to arrive, that is about 10,000 souls, no money is required for a man who can get into employment during the summer.

961. The question is with respect to a man not looking to get employment there, but supposing him to be landed at Quebec, what would be the expense at which that man could locate himself upon his land and put himself into an advantageous situation?—Making allowance for the varying circumstances to which settlers are exposed, I conceive that a man, with a family consisting of a wife and two children, can place himself very advantageously in any part of the provinces for 50*l*.; if he does it for less, I mean if he does it with the possession of less money, he will still have to borrow or to get an advance in some shape to make up that amount; or if he does not get that advance, he will still have to devote a certain number of days labour in each week for the acquisition of provisions and tools that cost him a hundred per cent more, gained in that way, than they would otherwise cost.

962. Do you mean when he is upon the spot?—When he is upon the spot, and in a partially settled country; this I conceive to be the average expense under the average of circumstances.

963. You state that a person arriving there without any money at all, by getting work on the canals that were going on in the United States, afterwards found the means of settling himself?—That is very frequently the case.

964. You are understood to state that emigrants have arrived there in considerable numbers, and in consequence of a canal that was cutting in the United States, a number of those persons worked upon that canal till they got a sufficient sum of money to settle themselves either in the United States or in the Canadas?—It has very frequently occurred that settlers have collected sufficient capital to commence their operations, by the wages gained during one summer's good work on those canals; but it does not follow that their establishment was perfect, they were obliged to work out the next summer, and the next summer after that, to place their families in as independent a situation as they would be in if they had been furnished with twelve months provision in the outset.

965. If the English government should carry on any similar work in the Canadas, of course a considerable number of emigrants may also dispose of themselves by the wages of labour which they may obtain on such works?—Unquestionably they might, and to much greater advantage than by gaining an equal sum of money in the United States, for this simple reason, that the habits of life acquired in the United States are not favourable to accumulation of money; a man who passes the whole summer at work upon the canals in the United States learns to live as an American, and he expends as much subsistence in the course of a week,

W. A. Fellow,
Esq.

6 March,
1837.

in the support of himself individually, as would support the whole of his family; whereas if he ever removes out of the Canadas into the United States, he retains the habits of frugality that he carries with him from Europe, and instead of eating three flesh meals a-day, accompanied with tea and cream, and so on, he will be satisfied with a small quantity of meat and other inferior food sufficiently nourishing and wholesome for his purpose, but unaccompanied with the expensive comforts of an American meal; he will therefore be richer by thirty or forty per cent, at the end of the year, than he would be if he had gone to the United States.

966. Are you aware that a considerable work is going on between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, in the Canadas?—I understand the Welland Canal is going on there; I am not personally acquainted with that part of the country.

967. If the Welland Canal is carried on, will not there be a considerable quantity of work for emigrants to avail themselves of for the purpose of working on it during the summer, and to enable them to locate themselves in the winter, either immediately in the neighbourhood or further in the interior?—There can be no doubt about it.

968. Can you state from your own knowledge the amount of the sums which have been extracted in the form of charity from the resident inhabitants of Upper and Lower Canadas, and have been applied to the relief of those unfortunate persons who, having left Great Britain or Ireland without capital or means of supporting or assisting themselves, have landed in the Canadas, in the expectation of finding employment there, and who finding no demand for their labour have consequently, in the first instance at least, been exposed to a severe degree of misery and destitution?—My answer will not apply to Upper Canada, I have no knowledge of it there; as to Lower Canadas, I have reason to believe that the inhabitants of Quebec and Montreal have been called upon, for every year since 1822, and have made large contributions for the relief of the emigrant population; those contributions, I believe, exceeded 800*l.* a year for each city; but, in addition to them, the Assembly of the province have annually granted a sum of money, for they have always been alive to the call of humanity, for the support of an Emigrant Hospital at Quebec. In the year 1823, they granted 750*l.*, in 1824, 600*l.*, in 1825, 700*l.*, in 1826, 950*l.*; and I believe that those sums have been found adequate to the support of the sick and infirm landing at Quebec, because I observe by the returns of the magistrates superintending that Emigrant Hospital, that only 230 persons were admitted in the course of one year, and I conceive the average of the whole four years not to have exceeded 250 persons admitted annually. His Majesty's government at home, on the first appearance of this great migration, at the suggestion I believe of Lord Dalhousie, gave 1000*l.* for the relief of those emigrants. Now, the distress which has been experienced in those towns has resulted from the introduction of about 10,000 souls annually, and the relief required would not have amounted to more than 3000*l.* annually, in the Lower Province; but if the emigration were increased, the distress for some years would certainly bear a much greater proportion to the absolute number introduced than it has done hitherto, when the number has been limited to 10,000; for example, if 15,000 poor emigrants were thrown upon the Lower Canadas, of a description perfectly similar to those who have been hitherto introduced, I conceive that, instead of 3,000*l.* sufficing to relieve their wants and distresses, it would require 6 or 7,000*l.* and perhaps in a greater proportion, as it increased, for some years.

969. Do you not imagine, if an extensive emigration were to be carried on upon the principle of planting, that in a very few years an almost indefinite supply of that class of emigrants might be received and absorbed?—I have no doubt whatever that the means of providing for the casual emigration hereafter, in consequence of the establishment of their friends by the aid of government, would be infinitely increased. If any distress were to be felt by the introduction of a larger population not under the protection of government, who I take for granted will go out in the same seasons when the emigration supported by government takes place, provided vessels can be found to convey them, I have no doubt that that distress would be met by the legislature of the province with perfect readiness, and that it might be compensated to them by the admission of a certain quantity or the whole of the surplus grain of the Lower Province into Great Britain free of duties. To explain myself, I mean to say that I have no doubt that the legislature of Lower Canada would take upon themselves to relieve all the distressed objects that may arrive in the province, in consideration of this boon being afforded to them; and that this boon need not be of great magnitude, it would be very easy to

6 March,
1827.

to show. I have no doubt that the free admission of 100,000 quarters a year, for ten years, would induce that legislature, if it were made conditional, to undertake to relieve the individual public and His Majesty's government from all expense which may arise from sickness or distress attending the introduction of any number of emigrants in the province; I mean in addition to those that are to be carried out at the public expense, because I assume always, that, send out whatever number you may at the public expense, there still will be a certain voluntary emigration, in addition to them, provided the means of transport exist.

970. Do you mean, that if the government proceed upon a regulated system of pauper emigration to which they lend aid, that that would be likely to be accompanied by another emigration going out by its own means?—I mean to say that it would be accompanied with an increased emigration. I take for granted, that the government cannot remove all those that are desirous of emigrating; I take for granted, that their means are not adequate to it at present; and I take for granted, that the tonnage of the country going out to Canada in ballast, that with regard to economy ought to be employed in that specific occupation, is only at this moment, I conceive, sufficient for the transport of 60 or 70,000 souls; but if the number were to be increased greatly beyond that amount, it would be quite insufficient.

971. Will not that difficulty impede the voluntary emigration?—It will operate to the extent of an increase of expense; but still there will be a great number go out.

972. Not paupers?—Not paupers, and not capitalists. The distress which has been felt at Quebec has been partly occasioned by the accidents to which all extensive emigration must be subject; when I say that only 250 have been received into the hospital, I should mention that in many cases families are left destitute; the emigrants who go, generally take with them 3, 4, 5, 6, or 8 or 10 children; and if the father of the family dies in the passage, his wife and his children are left destitute, and it frequently happens that, in addition to their destitution, they are troubled with sickness.

973. You have stated the number of persons that have been received into the hospital at Quebec, and the amount which it has cost to provide for them during late years; has not that been upon what you consider to be the worst possible system of emigration, namely, that of persons going out without any previous provision or arrangement, to provide for themselves as they can?—It has.

974. And the result of that has been, that out of an average annual emigration of 10,000, only 250 have found their way into the hospital?—That is the result; but more have required relief during the winter, able-bodied men, and it is for the relief of those persons that the towns have been burthened, men who have been improvident, have not laid by any money for their sustenance during the winter, although they were in the receipt of very large wages during the summer.

975. Of those 10,000 persons that have gone out, all the destitute and improvident among them have been relieved for the annual sum of 3,000*l*.?—I conceive that 3,000*l*. has been about the average sum collected.

976. You were understood to say, that you thought the best possible mode of location was to take 300 families, and to give them a place where they might have communication by water, with a market for their produce; and also to give them good land, in contra-distinction to other land?—I stated, that to give the capitalist any confidence in the repayment of the money that he might advance for the establishment of settlers, it was necessary to guarantee to him that those circumstances should be ensured in carrying the settlement into effect.

977. That there should be an union to the extent of three hundred families?—To make it sure to the capitalist that their land would be sufficiently valuable to cover the amount of his advance; and as a corollary, I should say that that is the best mode of settlement.

978. What do you suppose would be the sum necessary to enable a person to take out three hundred families, and locate them in the country?—That will depend upon so great a variety of contingencies, that I should very much deceive the Committee if I were to give an off-hand opinion upon the subject, it would require so many details, which are necessary elements in the calculation; I should require to take a long time to make the thing intelligible.

979. What would it cost a person, having a relation settled in the country, to transport himself, and to bring himself into contact with that relation?—That depends upon his distance from the seaport; the facilities afforded by meeting a friend established in the country are so great, that I should say, if a man is once

W. B. Felsa,
Esq.

8 March,
1857.

put down in his friend's family, or next door to that friend, supposing that friend to be established in the country, and to be able to raise food enough to assist the new comer, the expense will be governed by the price of the food that he can lend him, and that again will be governed by the situation.

980. If you were consulted by a person under those circumstances, what would you tell him he might go out for?—I should have to ascertain the expense of the freight in the first place; supposing him to be put down in Quebec, which we are told can be done for thirty shillings, but which I believe requires three pounds, he will then have to furnish himself with food for as many days as it will require to reach the place of his destination; and then if he adds to that upon the average about two-pence halfpenny a mile for travelling expenses, that will cover the journey; and therefore if a man were to come to me, and say, I have a friend in such a township, in such a province, I could tell him within fifteen-pence what would be the expense of going to him; but if the man were to say, I have a friend a mile from Quebec, I should tell him the expense is only the freight to that port.

981. Could any inconvenience, in your opinion, arise, or would any uncertainty of success be involved, in the case of any number of emigrants planted and located according to the system adopted in the emigration of 1823 and 1825; would the extent of the number affect their success, provided that, in point of fact, means did exist for planting and locating them upon the principle of advanced capital, according to the precedents of 1823 and of 1825?—None whatever; I conceive that the facilities of planting emigrants will increase with their numbers, and that in carrying on the operation in future the expenses will be very much diminished. As to the extent of the success, I believe that the more numerous the establishment, the greater chance there is of ultimate success, because they form a dense population, capable of assisting each other in all public works and works of magnitude that may be useful for the general interest; and as to their markets, a large number of emigrants established together will inevitably be accompanied with a subdivision of labour, useful to every individual interested in the settlement.

Jouis, 8^e die Martii, 1827.

Captain James Dent Weatherley, called in; and Examined.

Capt.
J. D. Weatherley.

8 March,
1857.

982. HOW long is it since you left Canada?—In the middle of January I left home, in the township of March, on Ottawa River, in Upper Canada.

983. You were residing near what is generally known by the name of Mr. Robinson's settlement in 1823?—Yes, I reside near that settlement; and frequently passed through it, in going to the sessions at the district town of Perth.

984. What impression has been created in your mind, as to the success of that settlement?—The settlers seem to be getting on extremely well with their improvements; I think I could venture to say, without any exception; I know of no exception.

985. How long have you resided in Canada?—Nearly eight years.

986. Has your attention been called to a point which has furnished a good deal of discussion and consideration, that is, the capacity of the settler to repay the capital advanced for his location, upon the principle of paying interest upon that money so advanced, redeemable at will, and commencing at the period of seven years after his first location; for example, supposing that 100*l.* were necessary to locate a man and woman and three children, upon a location of an hundred acres, and to give him all that assistance which is necessary to put him in a condition to go on by himself; would a settler so located, in your opinion, be enabled, without difficulty, to commence the payment of interest at five per cent upon that 100*l.* so advanced for his location, at the termination of seven years?—I have not the least doubt of it.

987. Do you think he would be able to do it in money or in kind?—At a much earlier period he would be able to do it in kind; but I think he would then, that is to say in seven years, be able to do it in money.

988. In giving that answer, you have reference to your own personal observation of the condition and circumstances of that class of persons?—From living very near them; frequently passing through that part of the country, seeing them and other settlers when they first go upon their lands, and seeing them at the expiration of five or six years; and, judging from the improvements they make in the extent

extent of clearing their ground and their buildings, I have not the least doubt that the progressive improvements that they make would enable them at the end of five years to pay in kind the interest of the money.

989. Do you think that the opinions of persons who have directed their attention to this part of the subject in Upper Canada, would coincide with yours upon this subject?—I have not the least doubt of it.

990. Are you of opinion, that if it were properly explained to the settler, previously to his leaving this country, that he would be called upon to repay the money so advanced to him, there would be any objection on his part so to repay it, or any practical difficulty in levying it?—I think not.

991. If one of Mr. Robinson's settlers were to be asked by a friend of his in Ireland, whether he would advise him to accept government assistance, subject to this principle of repayment, or to take his chance in that country without such assistance, are you of opinion that the settler would advise him to accept the assistance and repay it, or the contrary?—I have no doubt that the settler would advise his friend to accept that assistance, rather than to trust to his own resources.

992. Are there very large tracts of land of first-rate quality which would yield as good a return as that occupied by Mr. Robinson's settlers, that would enable any new settler to repay the interest at the end of seven years, if a large number were sent out?—I am sure there are.

993. Are there large tracts of land as good as that now occupied by Mr. Robinson's settlers?—No doubt, and a great deal that would be better.

994. Is there much demand for labour in that part of the United States adjoining on Upper Canada?—At present there is, on account of the canals there cutting.

995. Is the canal between lake Erie and Ohio finished?—Not yet.

996. Is there a considerable demand for labour?—So much so, that I have occasionally met with the emigrants going to the States to work for a few winter months.

997. Have any of Mr. Robinson's settlers gone over to the United States, tempted by that demand?—In December last I passed through that country in going to the sessions, and I had occasion to stop at one of their cottages; one of the settlers was preparing to go to work at the canal for the winter, with the intention of coming back as soon as he could get to work upon his own land again.

998. Do you know any thing of the number of voluntary emigrants that go to Quebec annually?—Only from newspaper accounts; I have occasionally been at Quebec and seen ship-loads arrive.

999. Do you know whether the number of emigrants has much diminished since the passing of an Act in 1824, called the Passengers Act?—I judge merely from the newspaper account; I should say not.

1000. You have stated, that you have no doubt that a settler would be able to pay five per cent upon the sum expended in locating him, in five years after his arrival?—If it was taken in produce.

1001. At what time do you conceive it would be in his power to pay the principal, with a view of getting the fee-simple of the estate?—A great deal would depend upon the strength of the family of the emigrant; if he was left alone to cultivate the land, I should suppose it would take a greater length of time; if he had two or three grown-up sons to assist him, he would very speedily do it.

1002. Supposing that in five years he should be able to pay five per cent upon the money lent him, how many years would elapse after that time before he would be able, according to your judgment, to pay the principal?—I should say within ten years.

1003. That would double the period?—Yes.

1004. Do you consider that in the case of an emigrant located upon the principle of Mr. Robinson's Emigrants, he would have a temptation after his year was out, during which he was rationed by the government, to leave his settlement for the purpose of going over and trying his fortune in the United States?—Not if he commenced immediately on his location to build and improve his land; there might be some idle character, that would make a bad use of the indulgence, and not clear his land, but I do not know of any instance of it.

1005. Are you of opinion that at the end of the seven years, supposing a man to have improved his land averagely and then to quit his location at the time when

Capt.
J. D. Wootterley.
8 March,
1827.

Capt.
J. D. Weatherly.

8 March,
1817.

the rent became due, that the improved condition of that land, taking into consideration all the circumstances of its intrinsic improvement and of its being surrounded by improved land belonging to other settlers, would be a fair security for the capital advanced?—I have no doubt of it.

1006. If a man had been industrious for seven years, notwithstanding he were burthened with his debt of £. 100, would it be his interest, having cleared his land, to remain on that land, subject to that debt, or to go over to the United States if he could?—It would be his interest to remain on his land, beyond a doubt.

1007. Although it was subject to the debt?—Certainly.

1008. Must not the success of those settlers depend upon their having a good market for the increased produce they may raise?—Undoubtedly; they easily obtain a sufficiency to support themselves and their families, but till a market is found for the surplus produce, they are not induced to extend their improvements.

1009. Is there a market at present?—I think I may say there is at present, for those living near the rivers, a good market; the surplus grain being taken by the lumberers, as they are termed, the people who cut timber for the English and West India market.

1010. Since the Canadian corn was admitted into this country, has there been a good market open to them?—No doubt.

1011. Has the alteration in the law, with regard to the admission of Canadian corn into this country, been seriously felt in Canada?—Very much so; and we look forward also to the opening of the West India Islands to our produce, which would much stimulate the Emigrant settler to exertion.

1012. Is that intercourse now interdicted?—We have never enjoyed it; it has been in the hands of the Americans. It will be an excellent market for staves, and horses and mules, and flour and pork. In fact it would induce the settlers to become very industrious.

1013. Do you conceive that a good market for the surplus produce of the Canadas, whether of lumber or provisions, would be the most likely mode of extending the successful industry of that country?—Undoubtedly.

John O'Driscoll, Esq. called in; and Examined.

*John O'Driscoll,
Esq.*

8 March,
1817.

1014. YOU are a resident in the south of Ireland?—I am.

1015. Have you had an opportunity of reading the Report and Evidence of the Emigration Committee of last year?—I read the Report.

1016. Have you directed your attention to the subject?—Very much.

1017. Are you of opinion that in the case of a population redundant in the sense in which that term has been employed by the Committee, the expense of sustaining that population can be placed at less than 4*l*. per head?—Not less, I am sure; I should place it at a little more than 4*l*. per head.

1018. In the case of a county in Ireland, in which it is admitted that there are 1,000 persons, in the proportion of 200 men, 200 women, and 600 children, for whose labour there is no real demand, and from whose absence, if they were taken out of the country to-morrow, no sort of inconvenience would be felt with reference to any work executed by them, or any production, the result of such work, do you consider that the county in which such a population resides can be charged with less than 4,000*l*. a year, in some shape or other, for the maintenance of that population?—There is no doubt that the county pays that in some way or other; it is paid by the land.

1019. Are you of opinion, therefore, that in such a supposed case, to relieve that county of that surplus population, charging the county with a county rate for sixty years, or with some assessment equivalent to a county rate to the amount of 300*l*. per annum, would be a most beneficial measure for the interest of the proprietors in that county?—I would consider it so, certainly.

1020. Have you had any opportunity of forming a judgment as to the disposition which exists among the gentlemen in the south of Ireland to meet a proposition for Emigration with any contributions in any shape, for the purpose of carrying the measure into effect?—I have conversed with a number of gentlemen, particularly that class in the county of Cork that are generally upon the grand juries, and they generally appear to me very anxious that some measure of this kind should take place, and they are very willing to contribute towards it, without having any specific plan upon the subject.

1021. Have you ever been able to ascertain to what extent any person or persons would

would be ready to go upon such a plan; for example, how much per head they would pay upon the population?—The way in which I have generally put it, was by proposing a small tax to the amount of about a shilling in the pound upon the county rate; such a tax would much more than cover the proposed 300*l.* a year for 1,000 persons. My own plan was, to propose that that tax of one shilling in the pound upon the county rate should be divided between the tenant and the landlord; that the tenant should be at liberty to deduct half, if not the whole, from the rent of his landlord; as both parties would be benefited, both parties would have a right to contribute.

1022. Are you of opinion that the grand juries in the counties of Ireland would be the proper source from whence any arrangement of this sort should proceed?—I think the consent of the grand juries would be very material, and I have no doubt of the consent of the grand juries, if the measure were explained to them; I think it would be well however to have the authority of Parliament, enabling the grand juries to act, in case they should consent to such a measure.

1023. When does the grand jury of Cork assemble?—About the 30th of March.

1024. What contiguous counties would you select in the south of Ireland, in which this question of emigration would be entertained with the deepest interest?—I would select the county of Cork, which is the county I am best acquainted with; I think that Cork, and Limerick and Kerry, would all concur in the measure, and, I have no doubt, all the counties of the south of Ireland.

1025. Do you conceive that it would be likely that from the interest of landlords, the Committee might calculate upon getting individual contributions of provision for the remuneration to be paid by charging their properties?—I am sure some individuals would contribute, but there would be a difficulty as to the mode of raising that voluntary contribution; I think a general measure would be more satisfactory, provided it were such a light measure as would not be felt.

1026. Has there not been a tendency exhibited in Cork, towards the establishment of something in the nature of a poor rate?—There was a strong disposition manifested upon the subject, which grew out of the very severe distress in Cork, which distress is considerably aggravated since that period.

1027. Was not that distress occasioned by a great excess of population unemployed?—Yes.

1028. Was not that disposition to create a poor rate met by a very general expression of opinion, that a poor rate, intended to keep these people at home, would be utterly ruinous to the country?—That was the general impression; public opinion was very much divided; on the one hand they were pressed by the excessive poverty and misery of the people, on the other hand there was a great reluctance to incur a permanent tax of that description.

1029. Was not there a general meeting held at Cork, under the pressure of extreme distress, which led to a sort of admission that a poor rate was necessary, or was advisable, in order to support that population?—There was.

1030. Was not that immediately followed up by parochial meetings in Cork, in which a general opinion was expressed that the property of the parishes would be utterly unequal to such support?—That was the fact; the general meeting was a meeting to which all persons were admitted, and they carried the question of the poor rate by a very large majority; afterwards, when the householders met in the parishes they were very generally against it.

1031. Do you conceive that, as an alternative to that evil, owners of property in the county would, either by general taxation or by some arranged mode of contribution, be ready to meet the expenses of a measure of emigration?—I am sure many would be very willing.

1032. Are you acquainted with the county of Limerick?—I know many of the gentlemen of the county of Limerick, but I have not much acquaintance with that county.

1033. Are you acquainted with the tenants of the county to any extent?—Not a great deal.

1034. Are you not aware, from your general knowledge, that most of the disturbance that has prevailed in that county, and which more or less breaks out every now and then, has arisen from under-tenants dispossessed, whose residence upon the ground is mischievous, not only to the principal landlord but to the middle farmer of the country?—I am sure it is the principal source of disturbance.

John O'Driscoll,
Esq.

8 March,
1837.

1035. Do you not conceive that a benefit, territorially, would be derived to the proprietors, if they were to substitute a moderate tax upon their land for the deduction from their profits which arises from a pauper population existing who pay no rent?—Undoubtedly, I think it would; and I think they are now beginning to understand that point pretty well.

1036. Are you of opinion that among the numerous class of petitioning emigrants in the south of Ireland, there would be any real objection on their part to bind themselves, and to consent voluntarily to the principle of repayment of the money advanced in their location, provided it were simply and clearly made out to them, that it was only by such repayment that they could obtain that assistance?—I am sure there would be no objection in the world; the people are extremely anxious to get away. If they had any prospect of repaying the money, they would have no difficulty in making themselves liable for it.

1037. Are you decidedly of opinion that if that were duly explained to them, it would not present a serious objection to the realization of a plan of Emigration?—I do not think it would present any objection.

1038. Has the subject of Emigration occupied very general attention in Ireland, as a means of relieving the distress and the inconveniences that occur in that country from over population?—It does at present occupy a considerable degree of attention amongst the gentry.

1039. As the attention of the gentry has been occupied in that way, do you conceive that any general questions emanating from this Committee to the Grand Juries in Ireland, would be likely to bring full explanations and replies upon that subject?—I think it would be useful to have such general questions proposed; but I think it would be better if some person were to take those questions to them, and were ready to answer such inquiries as the Grand Juries might make upon the subject.

1040. Do you conceive that any person being sent to Ireland without such questions, would be enabled to make his explanations in such manner as would bring the views of the Grand Juries in Ireland satisfactorily under the view of this Committee?—That would depend upon the person who was sent; I should think, if a proper person were sent, there would be no doubt of it at all.

1041. How do you conceive that any proper person who was sent without defined instructions, could communicate the views of this Committee?—I think his instructions ought to be defined.

1042. In every county in Ireland it is supposed that there may be many properties which have too great a number of people upon them, and others which have not too many; in that case are you of opinion that the gentlemen in those relative situations would be equally willing to impose a permanent burthen upon their property, for getting rid of a general excess of people in the county?—I am inclined to think that all the parties would contribute; for this reason, that the property which has only a sufficient number of population, is very much injured by a contiguous property which has too much. The pauper population of an over-peopled estate prey upon the population of the neighbouring estate, which has not more than its due proportion of people; they live upon their charity, and often steal from them; they are a great nuisance to the neighbourhood; and it would be nearly as great a relief to the estate that has not more than its proper population, to get rid of the superabundant population upon the neighbouring estate, as it would to that estate itself. I have found it to be the case in the country, that a neighbouring property over-peopled, was a great nuisance.

1043. Are you of opinion that the gentlemen in the different counties of Ireland, who might assess their property for the purpose of removing the over-abundant population, would take means, by their after mode of letting their lands, to prevent a recurrence of over numbers?—I can only speak from what appears to be the very general feeling upon the subject; all the gentlemen I have conversed with, in the south of Ireland, are quite aware of the necessity of taking such measures, and most of them are taking them progressively, as it comes within their power to do so.

1044. Are you of opinion that if in the first instance a general charge was made upon the county rates, for example, upon which the sum necessary for the contribution of that particular county was to be raised, it would diminish any objection that might arise upon the part of persons who do not consider themselves individually so much benefited as others from the result of the emigration, if it were to be part of the arrangement, that persons specially benefited by having their properties

properties cleared of their surreptitious tenantry, were to contribute a certain sum per head, 2*l.* for example, which 2*l.* should be applied in purchasing up the county rate, so as to diminish it as a general tax upon that county!—I am sure that such an arrangement as that would be considered a very fair one, and would take away any objection that might arise from the tax being too general.

1045. Where does that circuit commence, which terminates at Cock?—It commences in Clare, and goes to Limerick, from Limerick to Kerry, and terminates in Cork.

1046. Do you know on what day it commences at Clare?—About the tenth or twelfth of March.

Sabbati, 10^a die Martii, 1827.

John Smith, Esq. called in; and Examined.

1047. YOU are a banker, residing at Oundle in the county of Northampton?—I am.

1048. What is the population of the parish of Oundle?—About 2,500.

1049. What is the principal trade or occupation of the parishioners?—They follow general trades; there is no manufacture of any description.

1050. What is the amount of the poor rates in that parish?—From three to four thousand a year.

1051. Are there any persons in that parish, for whose labour there is no demand?—A vast many; when I say a vast many, there are generally from forty to sixty employed upon the roads, doing little or nothing.

1052. What is the manner in which the parish proceed with respect to those persons for whose labour there is no demand?—They are paid from the poor rates; they are sent to the overseer of the highway, to employ them in the best way he can, and they are paid from the poor rates.

1053. Can you furnish the Committee with any estimate as to the expense of a family consisting of a man, a woman, and three children, who may be utterly out of employment during the year?—They receive 10*s.* a week.

1054. Does that 26*l.* a year include every thing?—We do not provide any thing for them; we do not pay any rent; there is no additional expense to the parish for them.

1055. In the case of ten families, in the proportions of a man, a woman, and three children, costing, according to your estimate, 26*l.* a year to the parish, do you think that, provided those parties were disposed to emigrate, the parish would be glad to avail themselves of an opportunity of removing those parties by emigration, charging their poor rates with an annuity for ten years, to the extent of 7*l.* for each family, an Act of Parliament being passed, preventing their coming upon the parish again?—They would be very glad to get rid of a great many of them, but the parish has a great difficulty in paying the rates; there is some little uncertainty about their continuing upon the parish; we have certainly people of that description who are maintained by the parish after the rate I have stated, but there is some probability of their not continuing for ever upon the parish; they sometimes change, they get into employments, and others get out. I am scarcely able to give an opinion upon the subject, but I think they would be willing to pay a charge of that description, sooner than that the whole of the population should continue upon them, because I consider it is a most grievous thing.

1056. You will understand that the parties proposed to be removed must be healthy persons, fit for labour, and within certain ages; and they are not to consist of the old and infirm?—Certainly.

1057. The circumstances qualifying them to become emigrants in the view of the Committee, would be, that they should be paupers, and that they should be able bodied; if they were habituated to agricultural employment, so much the better; but if they were able-bodied, the mere circumstance of their being mechanics, would not of necessity disqualify them?—I think, in that case, the parish would be very glad to comply with the proposition that is made; I think, if it had been for agriculturists only, there would be some little question about it. We have a great many mechanics that are great incumbrances, such as carpenters, masons, tailors, and shoemakers, and that sort of people; there is such a redundancy of them, that they keep increasing yearly, and it destroys the good intentions of those that would work. They are put upon the road, a parcel of them

*John O'Driscoll,
Esq.*

8 March,
1827.

*John Smith,
Esq.*

10 March,
1827.

John Smith,
Esq.

19 March,
1827.

together, they do nothing at all; they go in the morning just when they please, they will not go out at the proper time of day, and they go home almost when they please, and they are paid according to their families; they are paid as much as a man can earn when he goes to hard labour; therefore a man that has been in the habit of going to hard labour, says, I will not go to work any longer, I will go upon the parish.

1053. Do you think there would be any indisposition upon the part of those paupers, when the subject was fully explained to them, to avail themselves of emigration?—I should think there would not; I have no doubt several of them would be very glad of the opportunity of going. I have here a letter from a man that was transported from Oundle, requesting his family to be sent to him, stating the great comforts he is now enjoying.

[The Witness delivered in the same, which was read, as follows:]

" South Creek, Sept. 14th, 1825.

" My dear Wife.—I have been anxiously waiting to give you some account of myself, and the country I am come to, but it was useless for me to give you hearsay account; I have now seen enough to satisfy me it is far before England, for a poor man and his family. When I landed in Sydney, I was taking off the stores by a Capt. King of the Royal Navy, and sent to one of his estates at the South Creek, on the great western road, and soon after removed to one estate of his over the Mountain, about 150 miles from Sydney, in the district of Bathurst Plains, and have been a shepherd ever since; my master and me agrees very well, and was my wife and family here, I should be as happy as any man in the world. This part of the country is very much like England—the winters and summers—and exceedingly healthy; it's a choice thing to hear of any one being ill. As I am now only a government man to Capt. King, I have but little chance to do much good; 10*s*. a year wages, and peck of wheat and 7 lb. of good beef every wk for my mess,—this is more than half the poor in England gets; but if I was a free man, I could get land to till, and cattle. Good wages are always given to a honest and industrious man, your ration found you, and a house too to live in; no rent or taxes to eat up your earnings, and what a man gets, is his own. Its now in your power to make us both happy for life, and bring up our little ones under our own care. The government of England has sent out to all prisoners that have good character, to send for their wives and families; and as soon as they arrive, they are to have their husbands given up to them; so that if you come, as I know you will, I shall be a free man, and you and the children will be sent out free of all expense, to be landed in Sydney. I have made application to my master, who is agent here for Capt. King, a Mr. Hayes, to give in a petition to government for you to come out by the first ship that comes; if you can bring a stock of cloths for the children, do. I don't expect you will bring any thing but yourself and children. You will soon be recompensed for your journey. The voyage I thought was dreadful, but I found it very pleasant; and so will you more so, in this particular,—I came a prisoner, and you are coming to make me free. My dear wife, I hope you will make no delay in coming out. I'll thank you to give my love to my mother, sisters, and brothers; kiss my little babes for me. Accept, my dear Sarah, the prayers of your ever affectionate husband,

"

"

Martis, 13^a die Martii, 1827.

Dr. John Strachan, called in; and Examined.

Dr.
John Strachan.

13 March,
1827.

1059. WERE you examined before the Emigration Committee last year?—I was.

1060. You stated before that Committee, your opinion of the capacity of the emigrant to repay money advanced to him for his location in Canada?—I did.

1061. Have you any reason, at this moment, to change your opinion upon that subject?—I am more convinced of it, from having examined the subject; I think that he could pay the interest, and after the end of seven years begin to pay the instalments.

1062. Would there be any practical difficulty, in the colonies, in levying that money or much expense incurred in so doing?—I should not apprehend that there would

Dr.
John Strachan.13 March
1827.

would be much expense; I think that agents would undertake to collect it at a very low per centage in small districts.

1063. Would there be any temptation to individuals, at that period, from being called on to pay interest, to leave their locations to avoid payment?—Quite the reverse; the sum that they would have to pay, would be much less than the value of the farm.

1064. Do you think that in case of accident, if persons left their location for instance, that the land itself would be an ample security, as a pledge, for the money advanced?—Quite ample.

1065. Are you of opinion that those persons in the Canadas, particularly Upper Canada, if they were to turn their attention to this subject, would concur in your opinion on this very point?—I believe every person who knows any thing of the country, and the way in which it is settled, would be of the same opinion.

1066. Would any danger arise from these payments being called for at any given period, so as to make it the interest of the parties to separate themselves from the country, to avoid that debt; are you of opinion, that such danger would arise, or that the transition from a state of discomfort to a state of comfort, would be such as to produce a grateful feeling towards this country?—I am rather of opinion, a grateful feeling would be excited; the population of the country is already so great, that no apprehension could be entertained of the other consequence, that is, of the people being displeased with government for exacting what they must be convinced was a just and proper debt.

1067. Do you think there would be any disposition in the local legislature in Upper Canada (under the circumstances of the emigration of persons properly selected, being planted there in the manner contemplated) to give any guarantee or assistance, in the way of repayment of this money?—I apprehend the legislature would object to that, merely from their poverty.

1068. Supposing individuals in this country were to lend their money upon that security, would the local government join in a guarantee, taking the lands as a security, and pledging themselves to the parties lending the money?—I think that the colonial legislature would hesitate to pledge themselves for the money, but they would be very ready to pass any Act, if necessary, making each lot of land liable for this debt first, before any other.

1069. In your opinion, would they give any facilities they could afford?—Yes; but I do not think they would pledge themselves, merely on account of their poverty; they would be afraid, not of ultimate payment, but of delay, which they could not, probably, bear.

1070. Do you think an individual, with a portion of land amounting to one hundred acres, arriving in Canada, would have a difficulty in raising such a sum of money upon the security of the land, as would be necessary for its cultivation?—I think that he would, not only on account of the scarcity of money, but because the land is of little or no value till labour has been expended upon it, and till it is cleared; most people have come to Upper Canada in low circumstances; it has been the asylum of poor people since its first settlement, there are few persons therefore of capital in it.

1071. What is the rate of interest of money in Canada now?—Six per cent.

1072. Is there a difficulty in getting a loan on good security upon payment of six per cent interest?—The difficulty is, that there are hardly any capitalists; I know but of one or two.

1073. Is there any law in Canada respecting usury?—The laws of usury of this country extend to the Colonies, but six per cent is made the legal interest there; any thing more than that comes under the laws of this country; the common law here has been adopted there.

1074. You do not think an individual of good character, arriving in Canada without funds, could raise money sufficient to enable him to cultivate one hundred acres, giving the land as a security?—I should think not generally, because the land till cultivated is of little value, but a person well known, a half pay-officer, or any person who had some other guarantee than merely land, might obtain it.

1075. Do you think that if an individual were to lend his money to a person of character, he would run any risk?—I think not, and it is illustrated in this way; merchants and dealers frequently give credit to that amount in the way of business, but they would not lend the money; they will supply articles to that amount, and perhaps more, and expect to be paid merely from the produce of the land, knowing that the creditor has no other property but that.

Dr.
John Strickland.
15 March,
1847.

1076. Do they in those cases take payment in kind?—Generally in kind.

1077. In flour?—In flour, pease, wheat, cattle, and potash.

1078. You have no doubt, though there might be a difficulty in getting the money, that if the money were procured, the individual would repay the interest which he stipulated to pay, provided he were an industrious man?—Yes, he could; if industrious, easily pay it.

1079. How would he be enabled to pay it?—From the produce of his farm; he would raise cattle and grain of various kinds.

1080. When would he be certain of finding a market?—The difficulty of finding a market has been very much overrated; there is hardly any part of the country, where one hundred settlers are established, but what a merchant or trader immediately settles himself among them.

1081. Supposing there were one hundred settlers, each one must depend on the produce of his farm for the payment of his rent, must he not?—Yes.

1082. Supposing there were ten thousand settlers, must not the same source of profit apply to all, or would they have any other means of payment than the produce of their farm?—No.

1083. Supposing that there were an immense increase of agricultural produce arising from the settlement of ten thousand persons, do you think there would be the same certainty of procuring a market for the produce of the farms, as there is at present?—I think a much greater certainty, for at present the quantity of produce exported from Canada is very inconsiderable; the merchants of Lower Canada cannot undertake to supply the West Indies or the Fisheries; but if the settlements were increased, and the produce was sufficient to supply the West Indies, and the Fisheries along the coasts of Nova Scotia and Labrador, the market would then be much more certain than at present.

1084. You think there is no doubt that the West India market, and the fisheries, would take off any surplus produce that could be reasonably calculated upon?—Yes, for a very long time.

1085. Why should the merchant who takes the produce of the farm, and whom you say always attends a settlement of 100 persons, refuse to advance the money necessary for the cultivation of the farm, if he gets the land as a security?—He is not a money-lender, nor a possessor of money; he goes with his goods to the settlement, to exchange them for produce; he has no money capital, he is frequently very much indebted to the merchants of Montreal and Quebec for his goods, and commonly makes his payments in kind.

1086. You have mentioned that if 100 persons settle, the merchant follows them; can you state what that merchant takes up to the settlement?—Chiefly groceries, hardware, salt, and clothing of various kinds.

1087. Is not salt a very material article there?—Yes.

1088. And tools?—Yes, tools for husbandry.

1089. From whom does the merchant who follows the settlers, draw the supply?—The majority of merchants get it from Montreal; some of them have money, and go down and purchase cheaper, but the greater number get their goods on credit, and make returns in produce as they receive it from the settlers.

1090. What returns do they make; can you state the produce?—The produce which merchants return is flour, pot-ash, pearl-ash, and salt pork; they seldom send wheat.

1091. In the evidence of Mr. Felton, he says he sold a great deal of land in the province of Canada to Irish and English settlers, at the rate of from three quarters of a dollar up to two dollars per acre; that the land which he sold was wholly uncleared, that it was perfectly in a state of wilderness, and in a majority of cases not even on a road, that in many cases the settlers were hitherto with a debt when they commenced their operations, amounting to 20*l.* a family; and that he never has experienced any difficulty in collecting interest on the capital from them at the expiration of the second, third and fourth year, and in a majority of cases, before the expiration of the third year, he has received part of the principal in payment; he adds, that in a majority of cases they borrowed provisions and implements from the neighbouring storekeeper to enable them to commence operations, expecting to pay those advances from the produce of their industry in the shape of ashes or provision, in the course of the next year; now if the settlers settling in lands so circumstanced, namely, almost in a state of wilderness, without money, have had no difficulty in borrowing from a neighbouring storekeeper such a sum as enabled them to commence their operations, why

do

Dr.
John Strachan.
15 March,
1827.

do you think there would be any difficulty with settlers who commence their operations with much greater advantages (namely, in having their land surveyed, and probably on a road,) in borrowing money upon the mortgage of lands so circumstanced?—There is no money capital in the country. If they went to a storekeeper, they might at once get any article he had in the way of sale; the word "borrow," should have been "purchased on credit those articles, which they repaid." The trader has a profit both on the articles he sells and the produce he receives, that is, he does not give the settlers so much for their produce as they would have got if they had not been in his debt before.

1092. Would an honest man, having a free grant of land, be enabled to get from a storekeeper, upon credit, such implements and provisions as would enable him to start in the cultivation of his farm?—There would be some difficulty in regard to some of the emigrants; unless the storekeeper considered them industrious and active men, he would not trust them; but persons who have been a year in the country, and know how to work and labour, would find no difficulty whatever in obtaining necessary supplies from the storekeeper.

1093. Do you not think that if there was a sufficient security for the money advanced (whether or no the sum advanced was in the shape of implements to the amount of 20*l.* or actually 20*l.* if there was such a security as Mr. Felton feels was sufficient) in the course of three or four years the amount would be repaid with interest; and is there not capital enough in the colony to enable persons to make advances requisite for the purpose?—Not in money.

1094. But in implements?—The merchants keep those implements which settlers require.

1095. What is the distinction between the advance of such implements as are necessary for the cultivation of the farm and the provisions necessary for the subsistence of a family, and the advance of a sum requisite to produce them?—I am not sure that I understand that question.

1096. You say that there would be little difficulty in procuring an advance of implements and provisions, but great difficulty in procuring advances of money; now is there any practical distinction between those advances?—There is a very great local distinction; the majority of the people there are farmers, nine-tenths of them; a small proportion are dealers, they would not be called merchants here; they are dealers in such articles as are saleable in the country; it is these dealers who make the advances; most of the farmers confine themselves entirely to their farms, and they have no money to advance; if they have any money, they generally purchase land for their children, and expend it in that way.

1097. There is a difficulty in advancing money?—Yes.

1098. Is there any practical difficulty in procuring upon credit, with a stipulation for repayment, such a quantity of provisions as would enable an honest settler to support his family at first, and such implements as would enable him to practise his occupations?—Certainly not.

1099. Are the Committee to understand you to say, that if a thousand families were to land at Quebec in 1828, there would be no difficulty in the individuals, whether dealers or merchants, immediately lending these persons such implements and advancing to them such food as might be necessary to sustain them until they were in a condition to support themselves upon credit?—I made a distinction with regard to that: I conceive that with emigrants coming out immediately without any capital, the merchants not knowing them, and not being convinced in their minds that they would turn out industrious, there would be difficulty; but there would be no difficulty in regard to a person who had remained long enough to show that he would be a good settler. The merchants or traders must have a moral confidence in their own minds that they would be repaid; the difficulty arises from the settlers not being known, and coming to a country exposed to labour to which they had not been accustomed. These two points require to be morally ascertained, before merchants will give them credit.

1100. If the only objection is that they are not individually acquainted with the character of the settler, and have no guarantee that he is industrious and likely to produce a useful settler, and that if they did know it, there would be no objection to their advancing them food and these implements, do you not consider it a proof that if money were advanced from this country, little or no risk would be run in receiving repayment upon the same principle as the local agent receives it from the individual settler with whom he is acquainted?—There is not any difference; what I mean to say is, it would be a matter of prudence with the merchant; he

Dr.
John Strachan.

13 March,
1857.

must see the probability of being repaid, and that prudence dictates he should know the person with whom he deals, and to whom he gives credit; but if the advance is made to those persons who go upon their lands as to the two last emigrations, there is not any body but what would credit them at once.

1101. Supposing a party of emigrants landed in Canada, and that they had such a character for honesty and for ability in this country as that the government would be induced to make a free grant of land to them, do you not think it would be taken by the parties in the colony, that they must be men who would maintain a good character in the country?—The merchant would judge individually of each person for himself; it is impossible to give a general guarantee.

1102. Do you think it possible that any legal association might be formed?—It would assist; but if the merchant were a prudent person, he would look at each individual himself.

1103. Do you think it possible that any Company could be formed in Canada, to supply these persons with implements and provisions upon a larger scale than could be done by individuals taking the land only as a security for repayment?—I doubt that, from want of capital; I do not think a Company could carry on the business so profitably as private individuals.

1104. Supposing an advance were made of provision and implements, for which a small amount of capital would be necessary, would not the dealer have this inducement first, a sale for his commodities by finding a purchaser of them, and next the land which would be a sufficient security for the repayment?—The land would be a sufficient security, but I am not prepared to say that a Company could easily be created in the Canadas; it would be difficult to show the necessity of forming a Company to do what can be better done by individuals, and there would be still greater difficulty in showing that there would be any particular profit from it.

1105. Do you not think a person lending money in Canada on the spot, advancing £. 20 in money, implements and provisions, would have a better chance of procuring repayment for his advance, than a person lending money in this country?—From his local knowledge he would have a better chance.

1106. Are you not of opinion that money is worth more than 6 l. per cent in Canada?—In truth it is, but we cannot get more, legally.

1107. Do you not think that if the laws respecting usury were altogether repealed, money would be anxiously taken at a much higher interest than 6 l. per cent?—In many instances it would; the way in which merchants deal gives them much more profit than the per-centage; they would not lend money; they get a profit upon the articles they sell to settlers, they get his produce at such a rate as enables them to get a profit from Montreal, when they send it to their own merchant; therefore money is seldom lent in that country.

1108. Are you not therefore of opinion that if there were no laws at all upon the subject of usury, that money would in fact be worth more, and that more than 6 l. per cent would generally be given for it?—More would be frequently given.

1109. You have stated, that to a person of good credit and respectability, a merchant would have no objection to advance food and implements to the amount of 20 l.?—Yes.

1110. But from want of capital in Canada, is it probable that if a great influx of emigrants were to go out to that country, that any merchants there could advance these persons food and implements to any considerable extent on credit?—I think they would if they had the guarantee I mention, or if they were morally convinced that the persons were worthy of credit.

1111. Do you think the merchants generally have capital enough to allow of such long credit as would be necessary in their general transactions for these advances?—The settlers would soon be able to make some repayments to the merchant, for he would be on the spot to receive any produce the settlers had to spare, and they would soon spare a little.

1112. Do they not find difficulty in collecting the debts they create?—Sometimes, as they depend upon the produce of the lands; but a great number of merchants have made considerable fortunes there.

1113. Are the merchants generally punctual in their payments, or the reverse?—I am not prepared to give an exact answer to that question, I do not think they are more backward in paying their debts than people generally are; some pay by instalments, some pay punctual, and some not so punctual.

1114. A gentleman, Mr. Felton, has stated, "I am so convinced of the great facility

facility which settlers, enjoying the advantage proposed to be afforded to them, possess to make their payments in the terms prescribed, that I should have no hesitation whatever in binding myself to the extent of 10,000*l*. to make up any deficiency in the payment of the first year's interest in either of the two provinces, provided that a proper degree of judgment be exhibited in the location of the settlers on the land; "are there many Mr. Feltons in the Canadas?—Very few are able to risk so much, but almost every gentleman in the provinces would risk something; I would risk 1,000*l*. upon the same ground, but I could not risk so much as 10,000*l*."

Dr.
John Strachan.
13 March,
1827.

1115. But are there many individuals of property who would guarantee the repayment, in various sums from 500*l*. to 10,000*l*.?—I think there are many.

1116. Supposing individuals in this country were to lend money upon the security of this land, do you not imagine, without difficulty, some machinery might be devised in the provinces, to enforce payment as well as if the parties lending it were there themselves?—Yes, I think so.

1117. Do you not believe the local legislature would give every facility to the enforcement of the payment, under such circumstances?—With the greatest pleasure.

1118. You have no doubt that the King's government would give every possible assistance?—Certainly not.

1119. Do you think, with the united assistance of the King's government and the local legislature, there would be any danger accrue to the parties in this country who lent their money?—No; and I was thinking of proposing a scheme in this country to facilitate settlers, and lend them money, depending on repayment at the end of seven years.

1120. Are the Committee to understand, that it is the general want of capital in the country, where there is a small population and a great quantity of fertile land, which is the reason why money cannot be immediately advanced in the colony on this security?—Unquestionably; want of capital entirely.

1121. Is there a considerable portion of the clergy reserves at present under lease?—Yes.

1122. Are the rents paid for these lands, or are they let at a nominal rent, which is received?—There was no means of getting these rents, until a few years ago.

1123. What were the difficulties in getting these rents, which would not stand in the way of getting rents from other lands?—There was no person, till lately, who had any interest in enforcing their collection; and there was a difference of opinion among the crown officers, whether it should be by common process or by extent, as belonging to the crown; a considerable sum has however been collected, and there will be little difficulty hereafter in making the payments regular, if proper care is taken.

1124. Are the payments now made or not, in fact?—The payments are getting more and more regular every year.

1125. Do you consider there is any difference in principle between the rent of the clergy reserves and the rent of any other lands whatever, or that the security is better in one case than in the other?—The people think that rent paid from the clergy reserves is an easy sort of rent; they conceive that other persons would be much more severe, and demand a higher rent.

1126. Would the inference you draw from that be, that you would be more likely to receive rent from the clergy reserves than from other lands?—Not more likely.

1127. What is the reason you have to expect they will be paid from other lands when the rents are heavier?—I said I did not apprehend there would be any great difficulty whenever proper machinery was adopted, which is not the case at this moment. There has been a delicacy; the reason of waiting for the decision of the Crown officers was this, that in one process it was expensive, and would eat up the rent for five or six years, it is so small, and it is a matter of consequence to ascertain that point first; but I apprehend there will be no difficulty in future.

1128. Are the Committee to understand, without recourse to some process of law, those rents would not be properly paid?—That would not be often the case if they were exacted regularly.

1129. Has it been the case yet?—It has, with regard to the clergy reserves.

1130. Do you not think that the fact of an emigrant gaining a fee-simple in his property

Dr.
John Strachan.

13 March,
1837.

property would be an additional reason for his paying the rent for that, than for the clergy reserve?—I mentioned in my evidence last year, that there was an objection against rent in that country; they like the fee-simple, and dislike any thing in the shape of rent.

1131. Is not rent redeemable the same as fee-simple?—Yes, if it is considered as interest, or a sum that may be bought up.

Captain William Marshall, called in; and Examined.

Capt.
William Marshall.

13 March,
1837.

1132. HAVE you had an opportunity of bearing the evidence of Doctor Strachan?—Yes.

1133. Have you been in charge of the Lanark settlement?—Yes.

1134. Are you intimately acquainted with the habits, and circumstances, and customs of settlers?—Perfectly so.

1135. Do you concur with Dr. Strachan in the opinion, that under proper regulation, there is no real chance of this repayment not being effectual?—I do concur entirely with him.

1136. You would not hesitate to give your own individual opinion to any persons inquiring if they should lead their money on such security, advising them to lend it?—Certainly not, I should recommend it as a safe security in the long run.

1137. Taking it upon an average, you would recommend it?—Yes.

1138. Do you consider, in cases where death or accident might remove the party, the land in itself would not be a sufficient security?—It would; as the country became settled, it would become more valuable, and thereby become a good security.

1139. How soon do you suppose that a settler of ordinary industry, located on his 100 acres, can begin to make any capital at all?—The general opinion is, and I am of that opinion also, that at the end of seven years he would be very able to pay the interest of the money he may receive.

1140. How much money, or money's worth, at the end of seven years, will it be in the power of that settler to pay annually?—It depends on many circumstances.

1141. If a settler had 100*l.* lent him, within what period of time would he be able to pay 5*l.* per cent interest upon that sum, and in what period of time would he be able to pay back the principal?—At the end of seven years he certainly would be able to pay interest, and that would always urge him to pay the principal as early as possible. If the interest is rigidly exacted, no doubt he would find it his interest to pay the principal in the course of time. It would depend upon what his family consisted of, whether they could render him any service or not.

1142. Would he not be able to pay more than five pounds worth of produce at the end of seven years?—Most undoubtedly he would.

1143. Could he pay more?—Yes.

1144. Do you suppose that at the end of seven years he would be able to spare 10*l.* worth of produce annually?—I think he would.

Jovis, 15th die Martii, 1837.

Walter Burrell, Esq. a Member of the Committee, made the following Statement:

Walter Burrell,
Esq.

15 March,
1837.

I WILL shortly give a history of the parish of West Grinstead. The last census taken, was 1,229 people:—married men, residing in the parish, 116; married women, 112; children, 298; labourers, 63, constantly employed; casually employed, 53; lost time of the 53 people, divided into months, 223, at 8*s.* per week, the average expense amounts to 357*l.* that is lost upon the 223 months. Parishioners residing out of the parish, but receiving occasional relief, 64 men, 64 women, 187 children; of these, constantly employed, 39, casually employed, 27; time lost, divided into months, 93—that, multiplied by 8*s.* produces 148*l.* per annum; this will amount to 505*l.* loss upon the labour. Computed age of the married male labourers belonging to the parish: from 20 to 30 years of age, 20 in the parish, and out of it, 12; from 30 to 40 years of age, in the parish, 39, out of it, 25, which amounts to 64; from 40 to 50 years of age, 26 in the parish, and 20 out of the parish, amounting to 46; from 50 to 60 years of age,

age, 21 in the parish, and 5 out of the parish; above that age, 10 in the parish, and 4 out of the parish, amounting to 14. There are 182 married men employed in the parish, and 51 farmers; rental of land, 2,349*l.*; tradesmen, 32; trade and cottagers amount to 166*l.* rental; making a total of 3,015*l.* For the last four years, there have been three assessments of 4*s.* in the pound; the number of acres in the parish, 5,251. And there is rather a curious circumstance as to the births, marriages, and baptisms; the Committee will find that in the last ten years there have been 206 burials, and the baptisms have amounted to 413.

Walter Burrell,
Esq.
15 March,
1827.

1145. Are there any dissenters in the parish?—A few, but not to make it of any consequence. The marriages in the last ten years were 82.

1146. Has the number of marriages diminished?—Yes: the marriages in 1817 were seven; 1818, eleven; 1819, five; 1820, seven; 1821, four; 1822, eleven; 1823, eleven; 1824, eleven; 1825, ten; 1826, five. The allowances in the parish are, for a man and his wife, with three children under thirteen, 30*s.* for the rent of a cottage; a man and his wife with four children, receives 3*l.* for rent, and 1*s.* per week for every child above three and under thirteen years old, to these, medicine is also given. Persons out of the poor-house, who are occasionally employed, receive 1*s.* 6*d.* to 2*s.* per head per week from the parish; widows, with a family of small children, receive 1*s.* 6*d.* per head per week; old widows, 2*s.* per week. It has been the custom of the parish of West Grinstead and the adjoining parishes, for many years, to let the boys and girls, from the age of 12 years to 16 and 17, from Lady-day to Lady-day, by giving their employers from 3*d.* to 9*d.* per week, and 40*s.* a year for clothes for each, which amounts yearly to from 150*l.* to 180*l.* It is supposed there are from 30 to 50 men out of employment, from four to five months in the year; and for three months, from 70 to 75 who are entirely dependent upon the parish for support. The number of men, women and children in the poor-house, is 40; but in the winter months it averages between 40 and 50, having at that time single young men in the house who cannot find any kind of employment. The parish pays 3*s.* a head for all in the poor-house, whether old or young. The amount of the poor rate in 1824, was 1,796*l.* 14*s.*; in 1825, 1,804*l.* 2*s.*; in 1826, 1,924*l.* 14*s.* The real fact of the case is, that several gentlemen, who have property in the neighbourhood, have been expending very large sums of money in making roads and forming canals, in order to keep them employed. Next winter this canal will be completed, we shall have expended 10,000*l.* upon it; and if it is so severe a winter this year as it was last, we shall expect to have from 70 to 80 people in the poor-house. I beg to deliver in a letter, detailing the expenses of the parish of Pulborough.

[The following Letter was delivered in.]

" Sir,

" I send you the Expenses of the parish of Pulborough in the county of Sussex, for one year. You will see that £. 318 of the poor rates are thrown away in idle men on the roads; and that in five years, including the highway rates, £. 3,552 have been expended on the roads, of which £. 1,932 have been taken from the poor rates. In the years ending April 1824 and 1825, the occupiers of land employed one man on their farms for every £. 25 a year rating in the poor book, which continued partly through the year 1826, except by one person occupying 400 acres, who will not take his proportion, which has induced the other occupiers of land to discontinue their proportion, and we have now 95 men on the roads, many of them without tools. Is it not worth considering, whether the determination of a large majority of a parish to employ the agricultural labourers in any way which shall not favour one more than another, with the approbation of the magistrates in petty or quarter sessions, might not be made legally binding on the minority? I am aware that much care must be taken to prevent an unequal pressure, especially on small parishes.

" I am, Sir, with great respect,

" Your obedient humble Servant,

" Pulborough, December 14, 1826."

" John Austin, Rector."

Walker Burrell,
Esq.

15 March,
1897.

PULBOROUGH, SUSSEX.

Acres, 6,000; population, 2,000; poor rates, £. 2,319 or 23s. a head; wages, 10s. a week; wheat grown, 700 loads; poor tax, 66s. on each load.

Expenditure from April 1825 to April 1826:

Extra work on the Roads (not required) to employ	£	s.	d.
Labourers in want of work	318	-	- ½
Constables, principally on account of Vagrants	23	2	7
Beadle, to drive away the vagrants	26	-	-
Acting Overseer, salary	26	-	-
Attending Bench and Justice, and fees and other			
journeys and expenses	50	8	3 ½
Horses and Carts to Petworth, &c.	9	3	-
Expense of two Appeals, both gained	44	7	2
County Rate	54	7	8
Medical attendance	72	12	6
Churchwardens, instead of a rate	12	4	3
Relief	1,583	2	9 ½
	£. 2,319	8	3 ½
Expended on the Roads, including } 1822 - - 838	12	9 ½	
highway rate, in 5 years	1823 - - 881	13	10
{ Highway Rate, £. 324.]	1824 - - 605	15	6 ½
	1825 - - 584	4	10
	1826 - - 642	-	-
	£. 3,552	7	-

of which £. 3,552. 7s. the sum of £. 1,932. 7s. has been taken from the poor rates.

1147. Are you of opinion that the distress arising from over population, the details of which you have now given to the Committee, as to certain parishes, is generally extensive through the world of Sussex?—Yes, certainly, except in a very few small parishes.

1148. Supposing that the redundant labourers in the parish to which you belong, were willing to avail themselves of emigration to any of the possessions of the Crown, are you of opinion that there would be a unanimous desire on the part of the rate payers to contribute to that object?—I have not the slightest doubt about it.

1149. For example, could you inform the Committee what expense you consider to be incurred by the parish, in a family consisting of a man, his wife and three children, who may be considered as entirely dependent on the parish for support throughout the year, with the exception perhaps of the weeks of harvest?—I should say throughout the year without employment, £. 25. 8s. it would cost the parish for a man and his wife and three children.

1150. Does that include the rent?—Yes, it includes the rent.

1151. That is the whole expense of the parish?—Yes, and without any children it would cost £. 18. 10s.; with one child, £. 21.; with two children, £. 22. 10s.; with three children, £. 25. 8s.; with four children, £. 29. 10s.; with five children, £. 32. 2s.; with six children, £. 34. 14s.

1152. Are you of opinion that the rate payers would consent to charge the rates of the parish with an annuity for 10 years of £. 7., upon which the sum of £. 50. might be borrowed, to furnish the means of promoting the emigration of any parties willing to emigrate?—I should say, without any doubt, they would be very glad to do so.

1153. You are of opinion, then, that the rate payers do not look to the occurrence of any circumstances that may have the effect of preventing those parties continuing chargeable to the parish?—They look unwillingly to the future; I do not see how it is possible to go on.

1154. You have stated to the Committee, that that artificial employment which has been put into action, must come to an end at no distant period, after which the rates would be more severely charged?—My own opinion is, supposing we have such a winter as the last, that the rates will be very materially increased; alarmingly

15 March,
1827.

alarmingly so next year, for I can state that in this district we have expended between £15,000 and £20,000 in the last few years, in the employment of the people; we have cut down every hill in the country and made new roads; we have made 16 miles of new turnpike road right through the country.

1155. In your opinion, would the rate payers prefer raising 50*l*. in two years, by instalments of 25*l*. each year, to spreading it over a period of 10 years at 7*l*. a year, thereby effecting an immediate sensible reduction in the poor rates?—No, because they are all tenants at will, and they would not like to pay down so large a sum.

1156. You think there would be a feeling that the best mode would be to spread it over a space of 10 years?—Yes.

1157. Would there be any objection to 10 years?—None.

1158. You are aware that it would be the intention of this Committee not to recommend any class of emigrants to receive assistance, who were not able-bodied and competent to work, and within certain ages; do you consider that that restriction would make the rate payers less desirous of availing themselves of this system of emigration?—No, because we cannot employ the people, as it is; we should be very glad to send out able-bodied young men of decent families.

1159. Supposing you had no alternative but to pay 8*l*. instead of 7*l*. which would cover 60*l*., would any objection exist in the rate payers to incur such a charge?—I think not.

1160. Do you think that the rate payers would be more disposed to pay an annuity of 7*l*. or 8*l*. for the space of 10 years, for the purpose of raising money for this object, or that they would be disposed to pay down the whole sum at once, or in two or three years?—I am satisfied they would prefer the extended period, because there is not a man in our country who will take a lease.

1161. Do you imagine, from your knowledge of the management of the parish, there would be any practical difficulty in receiving from parishes any charge upon their rates for that purpose?—I can see none at all; I would take upon myself to remit the money from this parish, to any person appointed to receive it.

1162. Do you think, as a general rule, there would be the slightest difficulty in arranging with the magistrates or the gentlemen in the neighbourhood, to remit to the county treasurer that sum which by the terms of the arrangement was to proceed from the parish?—I should conceive none at all, any more than in collecting the county rates.

1163. Do you not think that every thing connected with the levying and paying this money into the hands of the county treasurer might be carried on by local arrangements in the county, without mixing it up with the government, or a board of emigration, if any such were established?—Certainly.

1164. If the plan of charging the rates with annuities for 10 or 12 years should be acted upon to a considerable extent, would not any in-coming tenant two or three years hence find the rates very considerably reduced?—I should say decidedly so, there is no doubt about it; and with respect to people coming in, we know now how to manage those things; the only people coming in would be those belonging to the parish who resided out of it.

1165. The question applied to farmers entering into farms?—I have answered that question already.

1166. Are you of opinion that efficient local measures would be taken by the rate payers in this parish as far as legislation allowed them, to prevent the recurrence of a settlement that might lead to a similar redundancy of population, and similar inconvenience?—I am satisfied it is so much for their convenience and benefit, they would look very closely to it.

1167. Have you ever turned your attention to any measure of legislation which it would be desirable to pass, to give power to the rate payers to prevent such recurrence?—I know of no way except by pulling down the cottages; I am the holder of a great many cottages, and my only reason for keeping them up is, that the poor people would have no place to put their heads in if they were pulled down.

1168. Are the Committee to understand that the greater part of this parish is your own property?—No, about 1,700 acres; a great deal is my brother's property.

1169. The class of people to whom the cottages belong, are landed proprietors?—Yes, gentlemen residing at a distance; some of them belong to the farmers; these

Walter Barrell,
Esq.

15 March,
1847.

there are no gentlemen in the parish besides the clergyman, the Rev. William Woodward, and myself.

1170. How many cottages are paid rent for, that do not belong to gentlemen of property in the parish?—

1171. You have said, that a man, woman, and three children cost the parish 25*l.* 8*s.*; if there was a proposal to remove them, what would the parish be prepared to pay down?—I should say they would be willing to pay 6*l.* 10*s.* a year.

1172. It costs now 25*l.* a year to support these people; would there be any doubt the parish would be prepared to pay down 25*l.*?—I should say, as a proprietor, certainly; but as a yearly tenant of land, having no lease, I should decline to do so.

1173. Do you not consider it very unfair that the present temporary occupier should be able to charge his successor with a fixed annuity that should fall upon him alone?—It would be so beneficial to his successor, that he could not object to it; I have not the slightest doubt about its succeeding.

1174. To what cause do you attribute the presence of this extra population in this parish?—I should say first, that Sussex is infinitely the most healthy county in England, according to its population returns; in the next place, the farmers have acted upon a very absurd and stupid plan, they will not employ single men, the consequence is, that a man immediately marries; and they likewise give a premium upon population, for they give to a man with four children 1*s.* a week for that fourth child, and so on for every other beyond that.

1175. Are not the wages of a single man reduced to the smallest possible sum on which a single man can live?—No, I should say not; I employ a great many of them, and I pay them 10*s.* a week in the winter.

1176. You say there would be a difficulty in coming forward with an immediate sum from a temporary occupant; do you think any arrangement could be made between the immediate occupiers and the owners of the land, that could facilitate the raising of an immediate sum?—I should doubt it.

1177. If powers were given by Act of Parliament to mortgage the rates, and a change of tenantry took place before the debt was paid off, the in-coming tenant would pay less rent to the landlord than the outgoing tenant?—That depends upon the terms of the agreement.

1178. If there was a fixed debt upon the land, and a change of tenantry took place before the debt was paid off, would not the in-coming tenant refuse to pay the same rent that the outgoing tenant had paid?—No, I think not, in our county. There is one circumstance that, I think, I ought to mention: I have looked over Major Moody's evidence, and I am quite surprised how he should have been able to have collected so much information in the short space of time he was there, he must have been extremely active in his inquiries. In the parishes of Shipley and West Grinstead there are select vestries, and each has a permanent overseer. I have had from 20 to 25 men digging stones this year for me, as a surveyor of roads, in order to make a road which is of no consequence, in order that they might be employed.

1179. Do you think there is a strong disposition on the part of those persons unemployed in this parish to remove to North America of their own will?—I do not know, I never asked any body upon the subject; I only know, as far as the farmers and landowners are concerned, they would be very glad to send them.

1180. What is your own opinion upon the subject?—My own opinion is, they are very comfortable at home, and they would not like to go; but if I could persuade a few families to go, and they made a favourable report, that would alter the case.

1181. Have you any doubt that when the real state of the settlers in North America was made known, upon evidence that they could not doubt, that there would be any difficulty in inducing a few families to go?—None whatever.

1182. Are you not of opinion that others would be induced to go, if those families made a favourable report?—I have no doubt of it.

1183. If the existing poor laws were rigidly enforced, and no relief given out of the workhouse, do you not believe that a rigid execution of it would make the poor people willing to leave this country?—Yes.

1184. Do you consider, under the law as it stands, that supposing this sort of provision to be made for emigration, you can take effectual measures against the influx of new settlers?—Yes.

1185. Do

1185. Do you allude to any other means than by the destruction of cottages?—I think by other means, by the non-employment of people who do not belong to the parish.

1186. Could those means be adopted in parishes where the property was not confined to a few individuals of large landed estates?—I think so, in the weald of Sussex.

1187. Do you think there would not be more difficulty in preventing the re-population of the parish where the land was divided among small proprietors?—The tenantry have suffered so severely in consequence of this influx of people, that they would take measures to prevent it.

1188. Do you think that the prospect of diminished poor rates would counter-balance in the mind of the small proprietor the loss of the rent of the cottages?—I do.

1189. Supposing a small proprietor has three or four cottages, for which he receives rent, will he consider himself repaid for pulling down those cottages by the diminution of the poor rates from the absence of tenants?—I answer to that, that the poor rate is so high upon the cottages, that he receives no rent at all.

1190. You have stated, that in many cases the rent was paid by the parish; allowing the rent to be paid by the parish, will not the pulling down of those cottages be clearly a real loss to the proprietor?—Yes, a loss to the amount of rent of 30s.

1191. Will that loss be made up to him by his proportion of the diminution of the poor rates?—Not if it was a mere cottage.

1192. Do the poor rates and the cottage repairs amount pretty nearly to the rent?—I should say to the full amount of the rent.

1193. Does the parish pay rent for any cottage the inhabitant of which is not a parishioner?—No.

1194. Is not the law of settlement so well understood now, generally, that it is extremely difficult for a poor man to obtain a new settlement?—I do not see how it is possible.

1195. Therefore any new comer into the parish, to become an inhabitant of one of the cottages vacated by one who has emigrated, could not obtain a settlement in the parish?—No, the parish would refuse to pay his rent, which would be 10*l.* a year to make a settlement.

1196. Would not the consequence be, that the general rental of cottages throughout the parish would fall?—If the parishes agreed, as I think they ought, not to pay rent for any body, most of them would fall down.

1197. Is it not contrary to the poor laws, for the parish to pay rent?—All I know is, that if they do not pay rent, a great number of poor would sleep under the hedges.

1198. In your parish, where rent is paid for cottages, is it entered as rent?—Yes, as rent paid.

1199. Not as relief?—No.

1200. Does any power exist at present of borrowing money upon the rates?—I know of none.

1201. Do you think there would be any objection to obtaining parliamentary sanction for pledging the rates of the parish for a certain number of years, provided the rate did not exceed its present amount?—I think it must be done by Act of Parliament.

1202. You think it would be desirable?—Yes, certainly.

1203. If the tenantry at present feel the weight of a redundant population, how is it that they may still refuse to employ any but married men?—Suppose a man is married, with a family, they must keep him with his family; whereas they have only to keep the single man, without any family.

1204. Have you any poor-house in the parish?—Yes, it holds from forty to fifty people.

1205. Are you not aware that in Mr. Sturges Bourne's Act there is a power to borrow money to enlarge or build a poor-house?—Yes.

1206. Then, in point of fact, the charging the parish rates with an annuity for ten years, for the purpose of emigration, would only be an extension of the principle of Mr. Sturges Bourne's Act, to allow money to be borrowed upon the rates to build poor-houses?—Certainly.

1207. Do you not consider that, both in the payment of wages of labour in aid of the farming labourer, and in the payment of rent of cottages out of the poor rate,

Walter Burrell,
Esq.
15 March,
1837.

the country is submitting to illegal expenses, on account of the extreme distress of the population?—I do not know how to answer that, as to cottages, but I should say yes, if the parish paid for the labour of a person upon a farm; suppose I hired a labourer, and gave him only six shillings, and the parish made it up ten shillings, I should say that this would be wholly illegal.

1208. And that is countenanced in your parish?—No, it is not; we have decided against it; and I beg to add, that in my memory, twenty-four or twenty-five years ago, single men were kept by the farmers, and lived with them, they all dined together at the same table, but that has been long given up; and the reason was in consequence of the tax that was levied, for if when a farmer came home from market, and one of those labourers took his horse and put it into the stable, he was surcharged; and that was the reason of its being given up.

Mr. Thomas Bradbury, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Thomas Bradbury.

1209. WHAT parish do you belong to?—The parish of Great Horwood, in Buckinghamshire.

1210. Are you overseer in that parish?—Not at this time; I have been.

1211. You are intimately acquainted with all the details of the parish rates?—Yes.

1212. Have you had an opportunity of hearing the evidence just given before the Committee?—Yes.

1213. Do you concur in opinion with the Member of the Committee, just examined, that it would be to the interest of the rate payers to consent to mortgage their rates for a certain period of years, to raise money for the purposes of emigration?—Yes, I think it very desirable indeed; and I think the people would be willing to emigrate. There is one point in regard to paying rates of labour, it is an advantage to the large proprietor to pay the labourers out of the rates; for the small occupier, who does his labour himself, pays part of the large occupier's labour, which is very unfair; and it swells the rates more than it would otherwise do.

1214. You are of opinion that if the poor in that part of the country where you live, were made sensible of the independence which, under circumstances of industry, they might obtain as emigrants, there would be no continued disposition on their part to refuse to become emigrants?—I should think not; but such a case has never been proposed to them, and I cannot answer for it.

1215. What would you be disposed to estimate, in your part of the country, the expense of maintaining a man, woman, and three children, supposed to be entirely dependent on the parish for a whole year?—I should think somewhere about 25 £. or 26 £.

1216. You do not think, in point of fact, less than that is incurred in their maintenance?—No; the quantity of labourers in the country where I live, is about one-third more than can get regular employment, so that one-third is supported at parochial expense.

1217. If that one-third was removed, just as much real work would be done in the country as is now done?—Yes, undoubtedly; they are employed in some way or other, but the other two-thirds would do the labour.

1218. Are you not aware that the condition of that two-thirds is very much deteriorated and prejudiced by that one-third for whose labour there is no demand?—Undoubtedly.

1219. Have you any doubt there would be a disposition on the part of the rate payers to promote emigration, on the principle of contributing, either by paying the money down, or charging the rates; and that if it was duly explained to the poor, there would be no difficulty in their availing themselves of such opportunity for emigration?—No; I think it would be very much to their advantage, and no objection to it.

1220. Are there any manufactures in your parish?—None at all, except the lace manufacture by females.

1221. Is not the condition of the poor a suffering condition?—It is miserable. I took down an account, the other day, from a man who was some years older than myself; I remember his coming into the parish, with his wife, 50 years ago; he was sitting down in my house, and I said to him, Thomas, can you remember the price of provisions when you first came to the parish? he said he could; and I got a pen and ink and calculated every article, and the price of provisions in those

those times. I then asked him what his own rent was; he happened not to be in the same situation always, but he lived in the same house then as formerly, he told me the rent; the price of provisions I had got down in another column in these times; and I found by that calculation, that his labour would be exactly the same provision for a man with a wife and four children, as now.

1222. You mean a single man's labour?—Yes; it would be the same provision as was allowed now for a man, his wife and four children.

1223. Without any power of supplying himself with clothing?—Yes, without that: his labour was 6s. per week, now it is about 8s.; and therefore there are only 2s. to pay for all those extraordinary prices of provisions.

1224. Do you not consider that the main reason of the distress of the labourers now, compared with what it was then, arises from the redundancy of labourers, and the consequent depreciation of the price of labour?—Yes.

1225. Who pays the cottage rents in your part of the country?—Chiefly the occupiers.

1226. Are they paid out of the parish rates?—No.

1227. Do you think that the proprietors of cottages would be disposed to resist this plan of emigration, in consequence of losing the rent of those cottages?—No, I do not.

1228. You are of opinion that their sense of the distress of the poor, and the inconvenience of the present system, would supercede any objection on account of the loss of rent?—Yes, I think they would be disposed to emigrate, most of them; they cannot be more miserable than they are.

1229. Have you ever happened to hear this subject of emigration talked of?—Yes, we have read it in the papers.

1230. Have you ever heard any expression on the part of these poor people, that they would be disposed to go?—No, but I have not a doubt when it is communicated to them in a fair light, that they would be willing to go; there are many of them now going to the United States from several parts of our county; there may be some gentlemen here from Kent; I have this morning seen a friend of mine, who says a gentleman in Kent is sending them off by waggon loads to the United States now, and those that went first, that emigrated from this principle, are sending for all their relations and friends they can get to go over.

1231. Have you any further explanations that you wish to give to this Committee?—Not any thing particular, that I know of. I must say this, that I have been a farmer to a large extent, till unfortunately I had a large family, and my business was reduced. I have had a great deal of practice in parish affairs, and farming of all descriptions, and I think now the farmers take too much advantage of the labouring community; by being overburthened, they press them too much; there is a great deal of theft and sheep-stealing about the county, arising from that; necessity drives them to it; there has been a wonderful number in Aylesbury goal, for sheep stealing, and robbing hen-roosts, and those petty things; the goal has been thronged with them; it is distress that drives them to it. I know two or three who have a very good character, but the distress of the times has driven them to commit those things which they had never done before.

1232. Do you not believe that if emigration was to take place, that that description of crime would be very much diminished?—Yes, I do; and when it is properly explained to them, I have not a doubt many would be willing to go.

1233. Do you think that the parishes in the neighbourhood would object to paying £. 8 a year for ten years, for the removal of a man, a woman, and three children, supposing such family to be entirely a charge throughout the year upon the parish?—If they consider it in the right light, as I should, I think they will be in favour of it, rather than keep them at home; I think that it would be an advantage to them.

1234. You have stated, that the expense is £. 25 a year; consequently the immediate saving would be £. 17 a year?—Yes.

1235. Then the only question for consideration would be, whether there is any chance of the poor rates being diminished from natural causes during the next ten years, that could prevent their agreeing to such a proposal?—The rates fluctuate according to the price of bread and wheat.

1236. Have the poor rates been increasing?—Yes, they have.

1237. Do you see any chance of the poor rates diminishing considerably in your part of the country, unless a great portion of the poor are removed?—No, there is no chance whatever; they are more likely to increase.

Mr.
Thomas Bradbury.

15 March,
1827.

Mr.
Thomas Brindley.
15 March,
1827.

1238. Do not the poor live very hard?—Yes.
1239. What is the common diet upon which a labourer and his family are living?—Chiefly bread, very little else; only a bit of meat on Sunday.
1240. What sort of bread?—They have it at the bakers chiefly, it is a secondary sort.
1241. And tea?—Yes.
1242. Without sugar?—Yes.
1243. Or milk?—Yes, ten three or four times a day, if they are women.
1244. They get no milk?—There is very little milk to be had, or sugar; if you consider the allowance of six or seven shillings a week for a man and his family, there is not much sugar to be had.
1245. What are the rates you give to persons in your parish?—There is an allowance for children.
1246. What is the principle upon which you give that allowance to persons having families in your parish?—They give after the rate of one shilling each child more than two, when under ten years of age.
1247. When they are under two, you give nothing?—No, only the weekly allowance, and that would be about seven shillings a week.
1248. Then a man with three or four children is better off than a man not having two children?—Yes, he is.
1249. Therefore the effect of the rates is to tempt those poor people to have numerous families?—Yes, it is so; but absolutely in the time of war the poor live better, because they had a loaf each child; if a child was born, the man went directly and absolutely demanded his loaf, and he had a loaf a week, which amounted to half a crown a week, when the child lived upon its mother, for two years.
1250. What do the men get at road work in your parish?—They are put on the road, when there is no other employment for them; they are paid according to their families, a single man has 3s. per week, a man able to earn 8s. or 10s.; then there are some at 4s. and some 5s. and different wages; the reason for single men having such small wages is, because they are apt to stop at home instead of going to service, it is to drive them to service; they almost starve them to service.
1251. Those single men that are on the road, or in the gravel pit, paid by the parish 3s. a week, do they do much work?—No, very little, they go away for three or four hours; I have watched them a little time back. There is a road being made near where I live; I have found them three hours gone to dinner, and two hours to breakfast.
1252. Are they not in the habit of getting married, in order to get the allowance?—Yes; when they cannot live any longer as single men, they marry, and go to the overseer for employment and a house.
1253. They get married in the morning, and then go to the overseer for a house?—Yes.

Sabbati, 17^a die Martii, 1827.

David Poley Francis, Esq. called in; and Examined.

D. P. Francis,
Esq.
17 March,
1827.

1254. HOW long is it since you left the Cape?—Rather more than two years.
1255. Were you there at the time when Mr. Ingram's emigration arrived there?—Yes.
1256. Are you able to inform the Committee as to the condition of the parties now within the colony?—I presume they are generally doing very well; but there have been great obstacles to their doing well, in consequence of the immense debt they have to pay to Mr. Ingram.
1257. Are you aware of the extent of that debt per head?—It was 300 six dollars for each male adult.
1258. What will that be in sterling?—At the time Mr. Ingram arrived there, it would be 30l. according to the then rate of exchange.
1259. What do you imagine would be the expense of each of these emigrants, for their passage?—I think about 15l.
1260. Were they attended with their wives and children?—Generally.
1261. In estimating the expense at 15l. per head, do you mean generally for men,

men, women and children?—I think probably it might be done for less, taking a family.

1262. Will you have the goodness to inform the Committee what you estimate to be the expense of the passage, and support during it, for a man, woman and three children?—I made a few notes for my own information, if I may be allowed to look at them. [*The Witness referred to some private memoranda.*] I think about 43*l.* taking a man, his wife and three children, that would be about 9*l.* a head.

1263. Have you ever turned your attention to any simple principle of repayment which might be adopted with respect to a labourer going out to the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, where the demand for labour is such as to procure him adequate remuneration for his services?—Yes, I have turned my attention to that subject, and I think that it might be done, if not to the full extent, at least to a great part of it; but I apprehend there must be a totally new rate of wages previously established in the colony, for, under present circumstances, neither the price that is paid for a labourer can answer the purpose of the employer, nor is it at all necessary as regards the price for the necessaries of life, it is so much in excess.

1264. Did you examine the statement made last year before that Committee by Mr. Carlisle, as to the rate of wages at the Cape of Good Hope?—Yes.

1265. Do you consider that to be correct?—I apprehend Mr. Carlisle cannot mean it as general or permanent wages, but only wages paid under peculiar circumstances.

1266. Will you state in what respect you differ from Mr. Carlisle, and what you consider to be the general rate of wages for a labourer at the Cape?—Where I differ is in this, that the rate of wages that has been stated by Mr. Carlisle is paid by persons being obliged to employ labour at that price from necessity, not from any view of profit arising from that labour.

1267. What do you consider to be the average rate of wages of an able-bodied agricultural labourer at the Cape?—It is so indefinite, I can hardly state a rate of wages; labour has been so scarce, that it has been employed occasionally only. Where, for instance, the employer wanted any particular piece of work done, which in fact was necessary even for his own subsistence and that of his family, he would then be obliged to employ labour at any rate for a short period; but it could never be supposed for a moment that it would answer by way of profit; no produce which could be raised from such labour would be at all equal to the expense of 4*s.* per day, as stated in Mr. Carlisle's evidence of last year.

1268. If the produce is not equal to the expense of labour, how do you account for the produce being raised and paid for at that rate?—I think it is not, certainly not in the new settlement.

1269. Will you distinguish the different produces of different parts of the Cape of Good Hope, and mention the circumstances of labour which belong to each of them?—The old colonists, in the Cape district for instance, and those nearest the great market, can afford to pay more for labour than they can in the new settlement. The old colonists generally employ slave labour, or Hottentots, or any that they can get; but I am quite of opinion the old colonists would never think of employing labour at that rate 4*s.* per day.

1270. You have stated, that it is difficult to mention an average rate of wages, as the labourers are not uniformly employed; but at the same time can you inform the Committee what, in your opinion, may be considered as an average rate under those circumstances?—I consider that a entire new rate of wages must be established; I should say the rate of wages that is stated to be paid in the colony, 4*s.* per day, a person working two or three days in the week at most, would be sufficient to maintain him, and that might be considered the present average rate of wages.

1271. What can a labouring man, by his labour through the year, taking upon an average employment and no employment, put in his pocket?—The rate of wages of Mr. Ingram's settlers was about 2*s.* 3*d.* per day.

1272. Were Mr. Ingram's settlers bound by indenture?—Generally, I believe they were.

1273. Then what is the rate which a person bound by nothing at all might dispose of his labour for a year?—I think he would not get above that, 2*s.* 3*d.* a day, if he was constantly employed.

1274. But that 2*s.* 3*d.* a day would procure him a great proportion of the necessaries of life in that colony?—Every thing with comfort.

1275. If he were to receive only half of that sum, would he still be in a situation

D. P. Francis,
Esq.

17 March
1827.

D. P. Francis,
Esq.

17 March,
1857.

to command, as compared with the English labourer, a fair proportion of the necessities of life?—Certainly I think he would, in the interior.

1276. For 1*s.* 3*d.* a day he would be well paid as a labourer, if he had it invariably throughout the year?—Certainly.

1277. Supposing an emigration of labourers to take place to the Cape, well chosen in point of age and the competency of the parties to work, to what extent, in your opinion, could such an emigration take place in the course of the present year, so as to have the effect of supplying labour enough for the general purposes of the colony, at a rate that would enable the labourers not only to live comfortably, but would at the same time provide a fund which would progressively liquidate any expenses incurred in their removal?—I should think that the colony at present would take from six or seven hundred a year of all ages of the labouring class, independent of any who went to colonize; I make that distinction.

1278. In return to the question put to you in the early part of your examination, are you prepared to point out to the Committee any plain and simple mode under which an emigrant could, conjointly with the person into whose service he might go upon his arrival, bind himself to repay any expense, or part of any expense that might be incurred in his removal?—Yes, I think one shilling a day with subsistence would be ample for such purpose.

1279. What do you mean by a shilling a day with subsistence?—I mean if emigrants were to be bound for five years at that rate.

1280. What do you mean by the expression, a shilling a day with subsistence, is it exclusive of his provisions?—Exclusive of his provisions; I mean it as a general rate of wages in the colony, not alluding to the new settlement. I should calculate under these circumstances 300 working days in the year, which would make his wages amount to 15*l.*; supposing he was bound for five years, I think then 3*l.* a year might be fairly paid out of those wages towards liquidating the transport of the emigrant from Europe to the colony.

1281. What does his subsistence per day cost?—In the interior I think they could subsist upon from 6*d.* to 9*d.* a day with great comfort.

1282. Then in point of fact the wages of labour would be 1*s.* 9*d.* instead of a shilling?—Yes, they would, in the colony generally.

1283. Do you suppose that the colonist with whom this emigrant might be placed would undertake himself to pay that rate per annum, making his separate bargain with the labourer?—I think he might make that bargain, and safely; but whether there would be sufficient call for the produce he would raise at first, is another matter. I propose he should give the labourer one shilling per day, and have him bound for five years, and the 3*l.* a year should go towards liquidating the expense of his transport from this country to the colony.

1284. Do you mean the 3*l.* a year should be out of that shilling a day?—Yes.

1285. Do you mean on this statement, that the persons in the colony who are now labourers, should continue to receive wages fluctuating towards 2*s.* 3*d.* while these new settlers should receive wages at the rate of 1*s.* 9*d.*?—I think they would gradually lower to that rate, and by so doing they would in some measure supersede slave labour; because I am of opinion they would still get below that, if there were an adequate supply yearly.

1286. Are you of opinion, in case of settlers being sent out bound for the term of five years in the manner proposed, that when that period was over they would find opportunities of settling themselves as colonists, rather than continue to work for others as labourers?—No doubt they would.

1287. Then you are of opinion that that result would naturally lead to a perpetual demand for labourers at the Cape, to be supplied annually according to circumstances?—Yes, but gradually.

1288. You have no doubt, therefore, that in the course of the present year, if 600 or 700 labourers were sent out, consenting to enter, upon their arrival in the colony, into indentures to this effect, there would be no practical difficulty in absorbing all of them under individual masters?—I think there would not.

1289. What is the cost of daily slave labour?—The slave labourer, who is employed as a labourer generally, receives about 20 six dollars per month; that in English would be 30*s.*

1290. When you say that, do you mean before the change in the value of six dollars at the Cape, or the present value?—Before the change took place; but I apprehend

I apprehend that they make no distinction between the six dollars now and the six dollars then.

1291. Has not a great change taken place in the value of six dollars at the Cape, by the King's proclamation?—Certainly, between this country and the Cape, but not in the interior of the colony itself.

1292. By the law existing at the Cape, is a fresh supply of slaves legal?—Certainly not.

1293. The number cannot be increased?—No.

1294. And it has not been?—No.

1295. Has it not been, to a certain extent, through the medium of African apprentices?—There have been some driven in by the native tribes into the colony.

1296. Can the labour of free negroes be obtained at much less than the cost of 2s. 3d. per day, which is now the average cost of colonial labour?—Slave labour costs about 30s. per month, and their subsistence.

1297. Are you a proprietor in the Cape?—I went out as a settler in 1820.

1298. Are you still a proprietor?—Yes.

1299. Are Europeans as capable of field labour there as the Hottentots?—I saw no difficulty in their working there at any time, unless upon very particular hot days.

1300. Have you endeavoured to procure persons upon indenture, to go to your own property in the Cape, to work as labourers?—No, I have not.

1301. Why have you not done so?—Because I apprehended some measure might take place for facilitating the supply of labour to that colony.

1302. But if no such measure were to take place, would it not be for your interest to make your own bargain, and to carry out persons there?—It would be rather difficult to do that as an individual; when the servants arrive there they would be so dissatisfied with the rate of wages which I could give in addition to the expense of their transport, that I should not be able to keep them without great difficulty.

1303. But adverted to the distressed state of the population of this country at present, do you think a man who is half starving here, would be dissatisfied with the rate of wages he found there?—Certainly not.

1304. Are there not many other proprietors in the Cape similarly situated as you are, who might be disposed to enter into similar contracts as you say would be advantageous to yourself?—I think there are.

1305. And why are they restrained from entering into those contracts?—Because they would not do it as an individual measure; they think it highly expedient it should be done as a general and public measure.

1306. Is that for the purpose of reducing the rate of wages lower than it would otherwise naturally be?—It is certainly with that view.

1307. That is your object, is it?—Yes, because there is no produce which could be raised at the present price of labour, which would at all answer the purpose of any individual taking out labourers, to pay the present rate of wages.

1308. Are the Committee to take your opinion as expressed here, as your's alone, or are you deputed by any body of persons to express their joint opinion?—I give my own opinion entirely.

1309. Have you had any communication with the Cape, since you left it two years ago?—Yes.

1310. Has it been constant?—No, occasionally.

1311. Do you think that you are well acquainted with the state of facts with regard to labour at the Cape, at this moment?—Yes.

1312. Suppose, in pursuance of your scheme, a certain number of emigrant labourers were sent out and indebted to particular masters, would those masters take upon themselves the enforcing of the indentures, and bind themselves to repay the money advanced by government, by instalments?—I should apprehend they would, for this reason; it would make very little difference, in point of fact none, whether it is paid by the master to government immediately, or whether it is paid to the servant, and the government looks to the servant.

1313. In whose hands would you leave the power of enforcing the indentures?—In the district authorities.

1314. Supposing the servant was discontented with his wages, and was to leave his master, or in case of the death of the party, what security would government have for the repayment of the money advanced?—In case of the death of the party, I apprehend the debt must die with him; but the better way would be, for

D. P. FROSTER,
Esq.

17 March,
1897.

a counterpart of the indentures to remain in the office of the district, and if the master and the servant disagree, the indenture should still follow the servant, so that whoever employed him during the five years, or any portion of it, the condition should still be fulfilled by the person who actually employed him.

1315. Do you think there would be a possibility of carrying that idea into execution; or might not the servant very easily find masters who would engage him without inquiring into any previous circumstances?—It is very probable that servants could find masters, but they would not be so certain of constant employment.

1316. Are you prepared to state yourself, supposing your calculation of the expense to be correct, you would engage to pay to the government 3*l.* a year for an indenture of each man for five years, you taking upon your own hands the risk of losing the servant when you arrived at the Cape?—I give this opinion as my own, not as the opinion of the settlers; generally in the new settlement, they have rated the wages at 12*l.* a year. I apprehend that the power of the local authorities is quite sufficient to restrain a man in the district where he is employed, because, generally speaking, that man would not be employed out of the district, without inquiring into the circumstances as to where he came from, and by whom he was last employed.

1317. Would you be prepared, on your own part, to make to government that pledge upon your security which has been just mentioned?—Yes, I think I would.

1318. Supposing you wanted 20 labourers, and 20 were engaged in this country to be indentured to you for five years, and that you were called upon to give a security, or pledge yourself to pay 3*l.* a year for each of these labourers, taking the chance of a casualty of their running away or dying, and those accidents which are more or less matters of chance and not of accurate calculation, would you, under the conviction of the advantages you were to derive from the labour of these men for five years, at a reduced rate as compared with the labour now employed at the colony, undertake yourself to give a pledge to pay this money?—Yes, upon a farm that is cultivated by tillage, but not on a grazing farm.

1319. Why?—Because one is of more value than the other; less labour would be required on the grazing farm.

1320. Supposing you closed with the offer to take out 20, would you engage to pay 3*l.* a year for them as a repayment for their passage, providing all assistance were given you in securing their labour by local law?—Yes.

1321. Have you known any labourers carried out to the Cape upon indenture?—Yes, I took out labourers myself under indentures, when I first went out.

1322. Upon what terms did you engage them?—The same as I mention now 1*s.* per day, and subsistence.

1323. What was the issue of that arrangement?—Most of the men remained with me, and immediately the indentures were out they then provided for themselves.

1324. For what term were they indentured?—Three years.

1325. For what reason have you given up that system of supplying yourself with additional labour?—The reason is, that if I were to take out labourers, in the quantity which I required for myself, and there was no general system adopted for taking out labourers, they would immediately be discontented, and it would be very difficult indeed to retain them in my service.

1326. Upon any system of taking out emigrants, which you contemplate, do you speak of adult males alone, or of women and children also; and would you enter into any agreement with regard to the two latter?—I speak of adult males in the first instance, but women are quite as necessary there as the male adults, and children are equally useful; the children should be indentured under circumstances, according to their age, for every child there is useful in some way or other, from 8 or 9 years and upwards.

1327. Do you consider the labour of women and children is so valuable at the Cape, as to enable a person taking them out to repay by instalments the expense of the passage?—Yes, having the use of their services for a certain period of years.

1328. Would you therefore, supposing you were to carry over labourers, think yourself justified in pledging yourself to pay back, at the proportionate rate for five years, the expense of the passage of women and children, in the same manner as you have stated your willingness to do in the case of adult males?—Yes, there will be no difficulty in doing so.

1329. Are

17 March,
1827.

1329. Are you of opinion that the general feeling of the colony would be the same as you have expressed to the Committee?—I think, when it was generally understood that a regular supply would take place, that would be the result.

1330. Supposing that 600 men and women, and 1800 children, very young children, were to be sent over to the Cape in the course of the present year, are you of opinion there would be that demand for the services of all these three classes as to induce parties on their arrival to enter into bonds to repay by instalments a certain rate of expense incurred in their passage, having the services of these parties duly secured to them by local law?—I think there would; I speak as I conceive I should act myself.

1331. Are you of opinion that an emigration sent out on that principle, not previously engaged by individuals, would be disposed of in the first instance as easily as it might be disposed of in future years, by people entering into previous covenants to take a certain number?—Yes, it would; if there were an office established in the Cape where persons could register the number of labourers they required, it would take place, and it would be found there would be a great demand for labourers, and it would then be clearly ascertained what the demand would be.

1332. Is the labour of slave-women constantly paid for at the Cape now?—Certainly.

1333. Is there a considerable demand for it?—A great demand.

1334. Should you suppose that the labour of slave women is better or more productive than the labour of free women going out from this country?—I think not, slave men are generally employed now to do the domestic work of females.

1335. With respect to the African labour, will you have the goodness to inform the Committee whether it consists with your knowledge that it often happens, in consequence of the wreck and condemnation of slave vessels, a considerable number of slave apprentices are indentured?—That circumstance has taken place, but no circumstance of the kind has occurred in the last seven years. There was a small supply forced into the colony by the wars between the natives themselves, and they were taken as apprentices; they were forced there, as before stated.

1336. And the number of these African apprentices is not at any rate sufficient to interfere with the labourers that go out from this country?—Not at all, such a circumstance is casual.

1337. Would not a large influx of European labourers lower the rate of wages, generally throughout the colony, to the level of the wages of the indentured labourer?—Certainly it would have an immediate tendency to that effect, and it would gradually lower them to that standard.

1338. Would not such a reduction diminish the temptation of the indentured labourer to leave his master?—Certainly.

1339. Upon what terms can uncultivated lands be obtained in the new Settlements near the Cape?—Generally the party goes to the Landrost, the chief magistrate of the district, and he there makes a request for a particular piece of land; the hemroden is ordered to inspect it, and if it does not interfere with any private grant or public convenience, it is given to him; the district surveyor is ordered to survey it, and he then gets his title from the government.

1340. Is the land which is so given him, free from the payment of any fees?—No, a quit-rent is generally charged upon it, according to circumstances and the capability of the place.

1341. Is that a discretionary quit-rent?—It is an annual.

1342. Is the amount of it discretionary with the surveyor?—It is discretionary with the government, according to the report received as to its capabilities.

1343. You mentioned some time ago having taken out some indentured servants who staid with you three years, and at the end of that time left you; and you stated that during that time they were receiving one shilling a day; were those persons at the end of three years in a condition to enter upon lands as capitalists, upon their own account?—They saved money, for they had nothing but their clothes to find.

1344. Do you know in point of fact what became of those persons?—I believe they left the district, one or two were mechanics; they went to Graham's Town, upon the government works.

1345. Is it within your knowledge that any of those persons settled on lands of their own, after leaving your service?—I believe not upon their own account; one or two of them still remain upon my land, but not as servants; I allow them to remain

R. P. Fraser,
Esq.

27 March,
1847.

remain there; they had collected a few cattle, which is generally the case among the labouring lands of people, they collect a few cattle, and then they become small landholders or landowners.

1346. Do they pay you any rent?—No, nothing of that sort has been thought of.

1347. You consider the cultivation of the land by their remaining upon it an adequate return to you for allowing them to stay?—Feeding the land, improves it; there are only one or two persons upon it.

1348. Are you not of opinion, that provided a system of supplying the Cape with labour were established on sound principles, that with respect to the manner in which such labour should be employed, and as to all the circumstances connected with the land and the cultivation of the country, it would be best left to the discretion of individuals?—Certainly.

1349. Had these persons, who now occupy a portion of your lands, built houses at their own expense upon them?—They built houses before I left; I allowed them to build houses, such as are generally constructed by the settlers.

1350. If you wish to remove them, do you anticipate there would be any difficulty in doing it?—No, I apprehend not.

1351. Are you of opinion it would be desirable to hold out to an indentured servant, who may arrive at the colony under circumstances of emigration such as have been alluded to, that at the expiration of the period of his service, if he has conducted himself properly, he may have a grant of land, upon which he may establish himself?—Yes; I am of opinion that if labourers go out upon the principle which I have mentioned, according to their good conduct at the end of the contract, there should be some encouragement held out to them to become small farmers.

1352. Have the Dutch farmers been in the habit of employing English labourers?—The English labourers have disappeared from the district of Albany generally; many of them have got into the employment of the Dutch colonists, some have become a part of the family, as it were, living with them in the house; a great many have been absorbed into the colony generally under those circumstances.

1353. Are there not large tracts of land now in the occupation of Dutch farmers which are not cultivated?—A vast quantity.

1354. What are the causes of that non-cultivation?—The causes have probably been, that there has been little or no foreign market for their produce; that the restriction on the importation of corn has been such, that there existed no inducement for them to grow it.

1355. Has it arisen from that cause, or from the increase of cost in growing it, arising from the want of labour?—It has arisen from both, for the Dutch farmer would never think of cultivating this land, of course, without he could get rid of his produce; he knows pretty well what the extent of the market is, and he merely cultivates his land with the view of selling it in the internal market, and to raise sufficient for his taxes; but if there were a stimulus in any sort of way for him to grow corn, I apprehend the Dutch farmer would then exert himself, and cultivate his land properly.

1356. Where do you think he could find a market for his corn?—At the Mauritius, St. Helena, and South America.

1357. What obstacle is there to the export of corn to these places you mention?—There has been a colonial law against it.

1358. Is it in existence now?—I believe not; I understand it is now repealed.

1359. In your calculation of 45*l.* per family, did you include in it the necessity of complying with the provisions under the Passengers Act?—Yes.

1360. Are you of opinion that that estimate could be reduced, if the Passengers Act were repealed?—I think probably it might.

1361. In what degree?—I have not turned my attention to it. I mentioned one circumstance, but I don't know if the Committee understood me to say, that the new settlement would exhaust a supply of 600 or 700 settlers annually, I meant the colony generally, independent of any colonists who may be sent out.

Thomas Pringle, Esq. called in; and Examined.

Thomas Pringle,
Esq.

1362. HAVE you resided at the Cape of Good Hope?—I resided six years in that colony, half of which period I spent on the eastern frontier.

1363. Will you describe where you were settled?—In that part of the district of Graaffreinet now called Somerset.

1364. Can

Thomas Froude,
Esq.

17 March,
1827.

1364. Can you give the Committee any information with respect to 250 labourers who were taken out by Mr. Benjamin Moody to the Cape of Good Hope, in the years 1816 or 1817?—I beg to premise, that I entered the room without the slightest idea of being called upon to give evidence, but as far as my information extends, I will willingly furnish information. I know something of Mr. Moody's party, having seen various individuals of them in different parts of the colony; I believe I speak correctly, when I say, that with a very few exceptions, they are now in a thriving situation.

1365. But did they actually repay the money advanced for their passage?—I understand they did, with a few exceptions; and that those who have not repaid are persons generally of improvident character, who have wasted their profits as quickly as they made them.

1366. Did this 250 include women and children, or not?—It included women and children, but I am not quite sure as to the exact number; I know there were upwards of 200 souls altogether, but whether there were 250, or more, I cannot exactly say.

1367. Do you happen to know the details of the engagement made between Mr. Moody and these settlers?—Not very minutely; I know that the sum of money taken by Mr. Moody for their passage out, and providing labour for them, was considerable, I believe not less than 60*l.* per family.

1368. You know that in point of fact, these people did repay a sum to that extent, and, notwithstanding such repayment, you think they are now generally in a thriving condition?—In point of fact, they have generally paid off Mr. Moody's claims, and some few individuals of them now possess farms themselves.

1369. Have you had an opportunity of hearing the evidence given by the last witness?—Yes, excepting some replies spoken in rather a low voice.

1370. Are you disposed mainly to agree with him in the opinions he has stated; or would you inform the Committee of any points upon which you would wish to qualify your assent as to such opinion?—It is difficult for me, as I made no notes, to recall exactly what has been stated, but, generally speaking, I would concur with the evidence of Mr. Francis; there were however some points with which I did not quite agree.

1371. Do you concur with Mr. Francis in the opinion as to the real demand for labour which now exists at the colony?—I certainly concur with him in the opinion that there is a demand for labour in Albany, but whether it is to such an extent that 600 or 700 labourers would be absorbed annually, I would not venture decidedly to affirm.

1372. Are you of opinion that in the course of the present year that might be done?—I think 600 souls might be sent out, including men, women, and children, perhaps 700; but I would not think it safe to send a larger number till the experiment was tried, whether these were speedily absorbed.

1373. Are you of opinion that in the course of the present year, to the extent of 200 men, 200 women, and 600 children under 14 years of age, might be absorbed in the colony without difficulty?—The number of children might create some difficulty; such a large number of children below the age of 8 or 10 years could not be of advantage to the farmers.

1374. Do you suppose that 200 men, 200 women, and 400 children above the age of ten years, would be absorbed?—Yes, if the children were above the age of ten, I think there would be a considerable demand for them.

1375. Do you concur with Mr. Francis in the opinion that in the event of an emigration taking place to that extent, there would be no practical difficulty in finding capitalists at the Cape, who would enter into engagements to repay by annual instalments the expenses incurred in the transport of those persons, such persons being indentured to them for the space of five years, and such indentures protected by a local law?—I think there would be no difficulty in getting capitalists to employ a certain number, provided they were indentured at sufficiently low wages; that would be the chief difficulty.

1376. What would be the amount of the wages which you would consider capitalists would be induced to give over and above 3*l.* per annum?—Really I confess I have not turned my attention much to this point, and am not prepared to speak with precision in regard to it. I observe, from the examination of Mr. Carlisle, already printed, that a considerable number of capitalists in Albany have offered about 12*l.* per annum for male servants, exclusive of provisions; and so far as they have pledged themselves, I have no doubt that they would employ labourers

Thomas Fringle,
Esq.

17 March,
1847.

at such wages as those; although I am afraid that there is at present a great want of capital in Albany.

1377. Is it the custom in Albany to give subsistence independent of wages?—Generally subsistence is given along with wages; the servant lives in a house adjoining that of the master, and receives daily subsistence, exclusive of the money wages stipulated.

1378. What is the amount of money wages in addition to subsistence which the master at the Cape could afford to give to indentured emigrants, and at the same time afford to come into the terms suggested by Mr. Francis, of paying 3*l.* a head per annum in liquidation of the expense incurred by the passage?—I feel a difficulty in decidedly answering that question, and can only refer to their own opinion, when they say they could afford to give 12*l.* a year, provided the laborer was sent out free to them.

1379. Do you not imagine that a settler in the Cape receiving 9*l.* a year wages and subsistence, would better his condition inconceivably as compared with his situation as a pauper in this country?—Unquestionably.

1380. Would not that 9*l.* enable the settler to clothe himself, and expend the rest, or economize it, as he chose?—Yes.

1381. You think, upon the communication already received from the colony of a disposition to pay 12*l.*, that there would be no doubt that if the emigrant could be indentured for 9*l.* a year, it would be indifferent to the master whether he paid the other 3*l.* to the servant or to a fund in the colony?—Quite indifferent, I should think.

1382. Do you think that colonists there would be equally prepared to carry into execution this system, as to women and children of the age described, as they would be as to the adult males?—In Albany, I conceive, the demand for women would be somewhat more limited than for male labour, as women could only be useful in domestic service, and I apprehend there is not such a great demand for them upon the present system of farming there as there is in Europe; there are yet few extensive dairies to look after in Albany.

1383. Has any proposition come over, with respect to women and children?—I think there has.

1384. You would recommend the emigrants to be selected for such an object should be purely agricultural?—If agricultural labourers could be had, they would, without question, be preferable, but if purely agricultural labourers could not be had, I apprehend a certain portion from the manufacturing districts might be advantageously sent, though they would not be so valuable at first, inasmuch as they would require to be trained to farm labour.

1385. Are you not of opinion that the effect of introducing this emigration, on this system, would be to improve the condition of the Cape of Good Hope in its prosperity?—Very materially indeed; I am of opinion that the English settlement cannot go on prosperously, at least its welfare must be very materially checked, if there is not a number of labourers sent over to assist the farmers.

1386. Do you concur with Mr. Francis in thinking that the probable effect would be, that the parties so indentured, when out of their indentures, would become independent persons or small occupiers of land, or shopkeepers?—Many of them would become shopkeepers, so long as there was encouragement for additional traffic in the district towns; but I apprehend not very many would become small farmers; I don't think that farming upon a very small scale is at present profitable in that colony.

1387. It has been stated that the manner in which that is carried on at the Cape, is by persons first settling on other people's property; do you think that sort of location would take place?—Yes, to a certain extent; I know of several distended soldiers, who having saved a little money, have collected by that means herds of cattle and sheep, which they pastured on other persons' property, until their stock increased sufficiently to enable them to commence farming on an independent footing; they then applied to government for a grant of land, and some of these persons became very prosperous settlers ultimately; some of Mr. Moody's men, for example, have succeeded in this manner. But I must beg to observe that, generally speaking, the process of the labourer rising to the rank of a farmer could hardly be expected to take place in five years; I should say it would generally require a much longer period, and perhaps the majority would never accumulate sufficient funds to enable them to farm with advantage.

1388. If 200 men, 200 women, and 400 children, were to arrive at the Cape in the

17 March,
1827.

the case supposed, without fixed indentures, do you suppose that the settlers there would take them off of their own accord at the rates you have stated, or would they take advantage of the circumstance of the arrival of so many, and endeavour to make a lower bargain themselves?—I can hardly speak as to the disposition that might exist among the farmers to take advantage of such a circumstance; I should think however that the safer plan would be to have them either indentured in this country, or sent out upon some regular system, which would obviate any such difficulty.

1389. You would suggest that the indenture should be entered into in this country, with the parties who were to receive them?—I think it would be better for both parties; if you landed such a number entirely unprovided for, there would be a necessity for employing some person to look after their welfare, and prevent any undue advantage being taken of them by designing persons.

1390. Supposing all the emigrants were to be sent to the Cape on this system, that they should be under blank indentures, which should be filled up with the name of the individual colonist who might receive them, do you think there would be any impracticability found in absorbing this emigration?—No, I think not; there might indeed be inconveniences or difficulties experienced for a week or two, if they were landed at Algoa Bay, until the farmers could come down to engage them; for Algoa Bay, the nearest port where they could be landed, is above 100 miles from Graham's Town, and the centre of the English settlement.

1391. Do you concur with Mr. Francis, that it would be expedient as a system to establish a board and office at the Cape, which might communicate to this country the progressive demand for labour, so that the supply may be made in future years according to the wants of the colonists?—Yes, I fully concur in that opinion; I also think it would be highly advantageous if a Board were established in England, to communicate with any such office at the Cape.

1392. You are, then, conclusively of opinion that under such arrangements a system of emigration could be progressively carried on between the mother country and the Cape, under the circumstance of repayment for the expense incurred in their removal?—Yes.

1393. Have not most of the present farming proprietors stores, which they sell and retail?—No, I do not think that is common.

1394. Are you not of opinion that the greater part of the money wages under these indentures would be paid to the servant by the master in the shape of clothes and other comforts, and that they would receive little in money?—I don't think it is common in Albany for masters to pay their servants in that manner; though I believe it has been common to give them drafts upon the shopkeepers in the town, for goods in payment of wages.

1395. Do you think that system would be confined to the indentured servants?—I think the mode of payment might be left to be arranged between the master and the servant; I would not have it rendered obligatory on the servant to receive goods in lieu of money. But there is so much competition between the storekeepers in Graham's Town, and the travelling hawlers, that the masters would not find it advantageous to keep stores with that view.

1396. Are you a proprietor in the Cape at present?—No, I have left the colony; and have at present no intention of returning.

1397. Had you any indentured servant when you went there?—I did not go out with the intention of farming, therefore I took none; but some of my relations, and other individuals of my party, did.

1398. Had they any difficulty with the persons whom they took as indentured servants?—There was one of them, rather an unsettled sort of person, who gave his master so much trouble, that he got the indenture cancelled by mutual consent and by legal authority; the others served out their time, and went ultimately to reside among the Dutch farmers.

1399. Have you any means of knowing how many persons have been going out under indentures, annually, of late years?—Very few, if any, I apprehend.

1400. Do you consider the sum of 60*l.* paid to Mr. Moody for each family, more than a necessary sum?—I do not feel competent to answer that question, not being fully aware of the circumstances under which Mr. Moody engaged and carried out his party; I understand that he did go under disadvantages which must have greatly deducted from any profits he had anticipated from the speculation, which in his case was entirely a private one; he had to provide freight and

Thomas Pringle,
Esq.

17 March,
1867.

all other contingencies, which government, or even private individuals now, might probably procure at a lower rate.

1401. What sum do you consider would be sufficient, under ordinary circumstances, to carry out a family of five persons to the Cape?—I have not made any calculation as to that point; but I observe the Commissioners of Inquiry in the colony have reported it as their opinion, that from 15*l*. to 16*l*. is sufficient to land an individual, or male adult, at Algoa Bay.

1402. What should you consider the necessary expense for a family, estimating that it would cost 15*l*. for an adult male?—I could not give any opinion upon that subject, without further consideration; it has not hitherto come under my investigation at all; but certainly whatever may be the present estimate of the expense of sending out a family, it might still be materially reduced by an alteration of the Passengers Act, which throws considerable impediments in the way of emigrants going out.

1403. Do you consider the difficulty of obtaining labour, the principal drawback to the cultivation of the Cape?—I think it is at present the principal drawback, so far as regards the district of Albany.

1404. Is the bad state of the markets any drawback?—Yes, occasionally.

1405. Do you see any reason to expect a change in respect to the state of the markets?—Yes, I conceive so; I think an erroneous policy has been pursued in the colony, in regard to the restrictions laid on exportation of corn; it has been customary, whenever there has been any apprehension of a deficient harvest, to prohibit exportation altogether, consequently the farmer not expecting such restrictions, or being uncertain whether or not they might be imposed, has been accustomed to raise only such quantity as he thought the home market would consume.

1406. What are the natural markets for the produce of the Cape?—The Mauritius, St. Helena, and South America.

1407. What quantity of grain will those markets take off?—I could not profess to give any correct information upon that point; I believe there are Cape merchants in town, who would be able to give the Committee satisfactory information.

1408. Is not wheat, in point of fact, exported from the Cape to the Mauritius?—Not recently, I believe, to any extent, in consequence of the deficient harvests at the Cape, and the consequent want of surplus, which, from the arbitrary restrictions to which exportation has been subjected, is even in the best years seldom very considerable.

1409. Has not wheat been exported to South America?—Yes.

1410. What time of the year do you consider the most advantageous for sending out labourers to the Cape, with a view of getting employment?—I think it should be in the autumn; that would probably be the best season.

1411. Do you mean that they should leave this country then?—No, they should land at the Cape in the South African autumn.

1412. When would you think it expedient they should be embarked?—Perhaps in December or January, so as to arrive in February or March, in order to give them sufficient time to put themselves if necessary. I conceive it of importance that they should arrive there before or during seed-time; that is, from May to September.

1413. How long do you estimate for the passage?—Three months, or from ten weeks to three months, is the usual average; if you sent them direct to Algoa Bay, a week more should perhaps be added to the estimate; I conceive it would be highly advantageous to send them direct to the eastern frontier, a great deal of expense would be saved by that means, it would save 500 miles of coasting voyage, besides the expense arising from touching at Cape Town or Simon's Bay.

1414. Is corn imported into the Cape, or has it in average years yielded a sufficient supply?—My belief is that within these seven years it has been more frequently imported than exported.

1415. Whence does the supply proceed?—It has been occasionally received from England, Van Diemen's Land, and I believe from America; American flour has been imported, I know; that however, I conceive, has arisen from the prevalence of blight in the colony.

1416. Then there is uncertainty attached to the wheat crop there?—Yes, at present, but blight to any great extent has only prevailed during the last seven years; previously it had been unknown for 50 years.

1417. Have there been several consecutive years of failure of crop?—Yes, several years of partial failure.

1418. Do

1418. Do you think that is likely to lead to the introduction of another sort of grain at the Cape?—I think it is; and I should hope that the introduction of another kind of wheat may get rid, ere long, of this vegetable distemper; it does not affect maize, nor barley to any extent. Previously to 1820, barley bread was seldom or never eaten by the Dutch farmers, now it is occasionally used.

1419. Previous to these failures in these bad years, had corn been exported from the Cape to other parts, for instance, to the Mauritius?—Yes, and also to England, I believe, though rarely; I see no reason to doubt that corn might be advantageously imported to England from the Cape, provided it could be done under the same regulations as from Canada; without such encouragement, there may be eventually some difficulty of finding a sufficient market for the corn grown.

1420. What is the present price of corn or wheat at the Cape?—It is generally sold by the Cape measure of a muid, which consists of three Winchester bushels.

1421. How many six dollars did that sell for?—It has recently been sold so high as 20 six dollars per muid or measure of 3 bushels.

1422. What is that, according to the present British currency?—That is 30s. per muid, or 10s. per bushel. I would beg to observe, that the Cape is capable of producing many other articles besides corn, and though that may be the principal object of exportation from the eastern districts, it is not the only one; there is at present Merino wool exported to a small extent, a valuable produce, which promises to succeed on the eastern frontier; experiments have also been made in salting provisions for the Navy, and, from the remarkably cheap prices of cattle, an abundance is capable of being supplied; there is likewise a considerable export of hides, tallow, and other raw produce. I am informed by Mr. Thompson, a gentleman who has just now published a work on the Cape, and who is a merchant in the colony, that he has perfectly succeeded in salting provisions for the Navy, and it is his opinion that this sort of export might be very considerably extended. The climate is moreover well fitted for the cultivation of silk; the mulberry thrives remarkably well throughout every part of the colony. The expense arising from the high wages of labour is the great drawback upon cultivation of all kinds, and on new experiments of any description; but if that disadvantage can be remedied, the colony would be speedily enabled, I am convinced, to add many other exports to those it at present possesses. With regard to what I have mentioned as to the price of wheat, I perceive that my evidence has been mistaken; I did not mean to assert that the price of wheat was usually so high as 20 six dollars per muid in Cape Town or in any part of the colony, but in the latter part of 1825 and the beginning of 1826, when I was in Albany, that was the current price there at the time; the price of grain in Albany has been usually higher than at Cape Town, for, since the settlers arrived in 1820, there has been no redundancy, but on the contrary a scarcity in the eastern districts.

1423. Will you explain the manner in which supplies of wheat from Albany are conveyed to the market of Cape Town?—There never has been, to my knowledge, any redundancy in that district since the settlers went out seven years ago; on the contrary, wheat has been occasionally, I may say frequently, exported from Cape Town, to supply the settlers and the troops on the frontier.

Frederick Cartline, Esq. called in; and Examined.

1424. HAVE you heard the evidence given by the preceding witnesses?—Yes, I have.

1425. Are there any observations you have to offer to the Committee, as to your concurrence or dissent with respect to that evidence?—There is something I should wish to say relative to the rate of wages which is stated to be given in Albany. I observe the evidence which has been this day given differs, in some respects, from the evidence given by me before the Committee on a previous occasion. With respect to wages which are given in Albany, it is quite impossible to form an average rate of wages, for men are not paid in any general way, (such as) by the year or by the day, but are engaged to perform certain pieces of work, which they do in their own time and in their own manner, and they are paid for such work, not by the day but by the piece; now I know that the generality of them are in the habit of getting, in that manner, after the rate of 4s. a day, and frequently 4s. a day besides their provisions; I can speak to this point myself, for I have paid it, and I have known many instances where others have also paid it.

1426. Do you mean to state, that the work a man upon task-work can

*Thomas Pringle,
Esq.*

27 March,
1827.

*Frederick Cartline,
Esq.*

Frederick Corbale,
Esq.

17 March,
1837.

execute in the course of a day, has produced to him a remuneration of 4s. in money, independent of subsistence?—Most undoubtedly.

1427. Do you mean the Committee to understand, that you have known cases where a labourer in the course of the year has earned any thing like 300 times 4s., or that these are occasional days work, of which there is no regular supply?—It is impossible to say; the demand for labourers is so great, they do not confine themselves to work every day in the week, and as they are not engaged by the day or by the week, it is impossible to say if they so apply themselves as to earn that every day in the year; but that they do gain that rate of wages from different persons, when they are employed about particular work, I am quite certain, for I have both paid it and known it paid.

1428. Is there any particular time of the year at which wages are higher than at other times?—In harvest and sowing-time they may be rather higher, but, from the scarcity of labourers, all the employers cannot procure them at the same time; there are not a sufficient number of labourers in the settlement for every employer to have them when he wishes, and consequently one person employs labourers at one time to do a particular piece of work, another at another time, when he can get them; but certainly higher wages are given at particular times of the year, namely, in harvest and seed-time, when there is work to be done, which must be done under any circumstances.

1429. Could you state, with any thing approaching to precision, what a hard-working man, willing to engage himself as often as he could be engaged, might earn in the course of a year?—I have no hesitation in saying, that in the present circumstances of the settlement a hard-working man may find task-work every day of the week, and earn 4s. a day all the year round, independent of any obstruction, such as ill health, or loss of time in changing his employers.

1430. Will you be good enough to explain to the Committee, how it appears the proposition you conveyed to this country, which only meant to pay people at the rate of 12*l.* a year, came to be so low, when considered with reference to this extraordinary real practical high rate of wages which you have described?—Because the subscribers to the document I delivered engaged to take such a number of labourers as they conceived they could employ with profit at the wages they mentioned, but not otherwise; no employer is in the habit of giving 4s. a day all the year round; he could not do it; could he get a labourer at 12*l.* a year, he would employ him all the year, and five or six of them, or whatever number of them might be required.

1431. Do you concur in opinion with the two preceding witnesses, that if an emigration took place in the manner which has been detailed in the course of this examination, namely, 200 men, 200 women, and about 400 children above ten years old, that there would be no practical difficulty in absorbing such labour by the capitalists there taking the individual upon the indentures previously prepared in this country, at the rate of 9*l.* a head money wages to each man, and so in proportion for the women and children, they agreeing to pay 3*l.* in addition in repayment of the expense of the transport of such emigrants?—I think there should not be quite so many; if they were sent out with a view to the continuance of the supply, but if they were to be sent out in one year, not with a view of continuing such emigration, that such a number would be absorbed there cannot be a doubt, and there would be a sufficient number of persons found to employ the labourers at the rate stated, for instance, 12*l.* a year, or 9*l.* a year, returning 3*l.* annually; but such plan contemplates the labourers being indentured for five years; now the settlers from whom I come, generally speaking, object to their being indentured for so many years as five; they prefer them to be indentured for three years.

1432. You are aware the colonist may have his choice, whether he will pay 5*l.* a year for three years, or 3*l.* a year for five years?—That would too far reduce the rate to the labourer.

1433. It is necessary you should understand, that on the supposition of sending an emigration of 800 persons, future emigrations would be regulated by the real demands of the colony, to be ascertained through the medium of an office in the colony to communicate with this country, so that there would be no danger of unlimited Emigration, as it could always be governed by the real wants of the colonist?—I should conceive, then, that it would be much preferable to send a smaller number than 800.

1434. Is the demand for labour almost exclusively for agricultural purposes?—It is chiefly for agricultural purposes.

1435. Do you know any thing of the habits of the weavers in England and Scotland?

Scotland!—No, I cannot say that I am much acquainted with the habits of that description of people.

1436. Would they be persons well calculated for menial labours?—I should rather think not, from what I do know of them.

1437. You have a general knowledge, have you not, of the habits of the weavers of Great Britain?—I think I may say this much, that if a person has been accustomed to sedentary habits all his life, he cannot be well calculated for the active life of a field labourer.

1438. It is all field labour that is required, is it not?—Chiefly field labour.

1439. Is it not labour of a severe kind, requiring great muscular strength?—Yes, generally speaking; but there certainly are employments to which people of a different description might be put.

1440. But is that the principal source of a demand for labour?—No, it is not.

1441. Is the cultivation of the land profitable to the land-owner?—Under the present rate of wages it is certainly not.

1442. Do you conceive there are no other drawbacks belonging to that country, except the rate of wages, that render the cultivation of the soil unprofitable?—There are natural drawbacks that we have in some instances experienced, but we cannot consider they are to last always; the chief obstacle that at present presents itself to the land being cultivated in the colony with profit, is the scarcity of labour.

1443. What are those other natural disadvantages, and how do you expect them to be overcome?—The greatest that we have met with is the blight that the crops have been subject to.

1444. Does the present price of grain afford a sufficient return to the cultivator?—The present price affords a sufficient return, provided that labour could be obtained at a reasonable rate; and when labour is obtained at a reasonable rate, if the same prices of produce remained which at present exist, certainly the produce might be raised with great advantage.

1445. But if the effect of the increased quantity of labour was to give you a great increase of produce, where would you find a market for it?—That is a question which cannot, perhaps, be answered immediately; but the circumstance that (owing to the want of available labour) no surplus has yet been raised, may account for my not being prepared with any method in detail for the disposal of such surplus when produced; but that markets may be found, I think there is no doubt, for instance, the Isle of France, for butter, cheese, and a limited quantity of corn; South America for corn, and England for corn, wool, hides, &c.

1446. Would you wish to make any other statement to the Committee?—I should merely wish to make an observation respecting the apparent difference of opinion between the witness, Mr. Francis, and myself, on the subject of wages, which is, that the rate of wages as stated by me, relates solely to a particular portion of the colony, whereas that of Mr. Francis relates to the colony generally.

Lieutenant Thomas Charles White, called in; and Examined.

1447. HAVE you surveyed a considerable portion of the territory in the Cape of Good Hope, near the Algoa Bay, and can you speak to the extent of land which is unoccupied and uncultivated there?—I have surveyed the country between Algoa bay and the Sitsikamma river, to the extent of about 50 miles in-land.

1448. Is there, in point of fact, an extent of good land unoccupied, and not cultivated?—There is a great deal in that tract of country at the foot of the hills, particularly near the Croome river, and from the Sitsikamma river, and it is unoccupied at present, at least it was at the time I made the survey; it is a kind of land and country which the Dutch farmers set no value upon, there being too much moisture, the grass is too rank; they give their attention almost exclusively to grazing; but it would answer the purpose of an English settler much better than any kind of soil to be found in the country, and to which they would give preference.

1449. Have you had an opportunity of hearing the evidence which has been given by the preceding witnesses?—Yes.

1450. Are you disposed to concur generally with them as to the probability of the absorption of such a number of emigrants as has been mentioned?—Yes, in that respect I perfectly concur with them; but in some respects I differ with them, and with a great number of individuals at the Cape, for whose judgment I have a great respect. It strikes me that the prospects of a man going out there may be much better

*Frederick Carbutt,
Esq.*

17 March,
1827.

*Lieut.
T. C. White.*

17 March,
1827.

LAST
T. C. H. 4th.

17 March,
1827.

better than those of his employer. I don't anticipate much profit to the farmer from the employment of labourers, but it strikes me that there is no doubt in the world that in a very short time the labourer will find himself in very easy circumstances, and in a condition to provide food for his family without any very great degree even of personal labour.

1451. In point of fact, if such is your opinion, you would naturally suppose that these indentured labourers would merge into the class of shopmen and farmers, after their indentures were over?—Very soon after.

1452. You think the general population of the Cape would be increased, and require an annual supply of labour to feed them?—Yes, I think so.

1453. Would it be possible for the population to increase in a more beneficial manner than in this progression, in going out as indentured labourers, and then becoming capitalists?—No, I think not, except they were sent out with such assistance from government as to enable them to become proprietors without passing through the state of farmers' labourers in the first instance; I conceive that might be accomplished without any great assistance from government, but it would be required to some extent; provisions are extremely cheap; beef in the interior does not exceed three farthings per pound, and in those years when the corn fails there are a great many substitutes which are not liable to blight, and which would answer them, if they are located into a proper situation; there is an abundant supply of provision and food.

1454. Have you had an opportunity of reading the Report of the Evidence taken last year before the Committee?—I saw Mr. Carlisle's evidence, given before the Committee.

1455. You did not read the Canadian Evidence, did you?—No.

1456. You have stated, that you consider the situation of a labourer going out, to be more advantageous than that of the person who employs him; will you state the grounds upon which you give that opinion?—It appears to me that the demand would not be at all commensurate with the supply, should the number of capitalists be materially increased; that the farmer's produce would be too great, there would be no sale for it, unless a new market were opened for it; but the man who merely looks to a sufficiency for the maintenance of his own family would not be liable to the same disappointment as the farmer, who produces more than he requires himself, with a view to sell; one is free from the disappointment to which the other is exposed.

1457. But under these circumstances, upon what grounds do you found the opinion that there is an inducement for the farther extension of the cultivation of the soil?—In my own case, I may state I am going out there; it is my intention to occupy a grant of land made to me, and in order to cultivate or to bring it to a certain degree of cultivation, it is indispensably necessary that I should have a few servants to assist, setting aside for the present the probability of profit from their labours; the land is of no use to me without labourers, it would not support my own family; and from my own personal knowledge, there are many individuals in the colony who are similarly situated, and who require servants at the present moment; but as to the number required I am not at all prepared to say, but I know many instances personally where they are required.

1458. You look, then, to going there for the purpose of obtaining a mere existence, without selling such surplus produce as is to give you any of the luxuries of life?—It is more with a view to employment and amusement, and for the conveniences of domestic life, that servants are required by the persons to whom I have alluded. I do not see myself how the farmer is to improve his circumstances by the employment of labourers beyond what I have mentioned; he is not permitted to export any surplus produce.

1459. If the supply of produce be redundant one year, will not the demand for labour fall off the next year?—Yes, I think so, certainly.

1460. The tendency of the supply of produce, you say, is to become redundant, consequently the tendency of the demand for labour must be to decrease, must it not?—Yes; at present I may say there is no supply of labour; it is necessary, to induce a few people of the labouring class, who are in that colony at present, to do any thing for the capitalist, to make them very tempting offers, absolutely to bribe them to do it.

1461. Are the Committee to understand you to say, that small as the supply of labour is, it is still redundant with regard to the produce, and the produce is greater than the demand?—Not at present; a demand for labour exists at the present moment, but to what extent I am not prepared to say; I know it does exist.

Few

Few capitalists who went out in 1819 have a single servant on their farm at this moment; they certainly require two or three; the common conveniencies and comforts of life require that they should have that number of persons.

1462. Do you consider that the great temptation which there evidently is to exchange the condition of a labourer for the condition of a small farmer, arises not so much from the increased profits, as the desire of independent possession of property?—I think it is the desire of independence; the climate is mild, little is required, few clothes necessary, a house is soon built, food is extremely cheap, so that there is hardly occasion for exertion to obtain all these things.

1463. But beyond the condition of a labouring farmer cultivating his own soil, do you think it extremely difficult for a colonist to rise?—I think it is, under existing circumstances.

1464. You have heard the proposition which has been made to some of the preceding witnesses, with respect to sending out labourers to serve under indenture for a certain number of years?—Yes.

1465. Do you think that it would be worth while for a settler at the Cape to enter into terms for engaging a labourer for a number of years, at small wages, under indenture?—Yes.

1466. Why do you think that would be worth while, if the demand for labour is so uncertain as you represent it to be in the case of settlers at the Cape?—A great number of individuals are desirous of having labourers sent out to them, not with a view to profit, but domestic comfort. My opinion is, the colony is able to maintain a very large increase of a certain class of its population, the small farmer cultivating his own soil, not the capitalists, nor the men who set out as farmers of a superior order. I have no doubt that some labourers are very much required there, for the purposes I have mentioned.

1467. Does your opinion coincide with that of the other witnesses, that in the course of the Autumn of this year, two hundred men, two hundred women, and four hundred children above 10 years old, landed at the Cape, would be taken up by the colonists, on the principle of paying 9*l.* money wages, and 3*l.* a year as a repayment for the expense of the transport of each individual?—I think to that extent they would find immediate employment.

1468. Have you any market for your surplus produce?—Not that I am aware of, under existing colonial regulations. I conceive a great number of persons in the colony would be glad to get labourers from England, even though it led to a diminution of their income; I do not say this of persons who derive their income from business as farmers, but of those who are in possession of incomes differently derived.

1469. Do you know whether in average years the colony has grown enough food for its own support, or whether it is in the habit of importing?—I think, with the exception of flour occasionally, nothing is imported into the colony in the shape of provisions; there is an abundance of animal food constantly to be had, and those vegetables which are not liable to be affected by blight (which has been the case with corn lately,) supply abundant provisions for the inhabitants; there are potatoes, and a species of bean, and the pumpkin, and a variety of vegetables, crops of which are quite certain, provided a proper situation is chosen for them.

1470. Is there a great want of artificers in this new settled country?—No, I think not, the supply in 1819 was very great, I think quite equal to the wants of the colony.

1471. It is principally the mere day-labourer, then, that is wanted?—Yes; for, notwithstanding I have a different opinion from those gentlemen who state the necessity of additional labour with a view to profit by the farmer, I am convinced the colony is able to support a very great increase in its present population; and the idea that they are not so immediately required by the farmer, whose sole object is profit, is founded on this, that he is obliged to sell his produce at a very low rate indeed in favourable seasons. When I went there in 1819, wheat could be purchased in the vicinity of Cape Town for 3*s.* per bushel, and that was not an abundant year.

Henry Ellis, Esq. called in; and Examined:

1472. WILL you have the goodness to state to the Committee, your opinion as to the opening prospects of the Cape of Good Hope, under the circumstance of an annual supply of labour in proportion to the demand?—I have no question that the Cape can absorb an annual supply of labour, provided that supply be proportionate

Leut.
T. C. White.

17 March,
1827.

*Henry Ellis,
Esq.*

Henry Ellis,
Esq.

17 March,
1827.

portionate to the demand of the colony, and I add, a demand actually exists in the colony for that labour.

1473. Are you not of opinion that one of the consequences of such a regulated supply will be to increase natural productions at the Cape, for which a market will ultimately be found?—I have no doubt of it, inasmuch as certainly there never has yet been an adequate supply of labour in the Cape, nor have the capabilities of the colony at all been brought forth in consequence.

1474. Do you not consider that the main impediment to the development of the resources of the colony is constituted by the deficiency of the supply of labour?—Inasmuch as where there is a quantity of land capable of cultivation, and capable of various productions, and that that land has not been cultivated from want of labour, I conceive there can be no doubt that the colony is susceptible of very considerable improvement.

1475. How many years were you resident there?—Only two years; not quite two.

1476. Will you have the goodness to instance that by the Cape itself?—I give as an instance, Cape Town; if it were merely to be retained as a military and naval port, there would be no reason why more corn or provisions of any kind should be grown than was sufficient to supply the garrison and the crews of the ships happening to touch there; in point of fact, the cultivation has gone much beyond that; this has arisen from the increasing population. The vine has been grown there; that would never have been grown, if it had not been for the increase of population, and labour being directed to such productions as the soil was capable of bearing. If it had been merely looked to in a military or naval point of view, no district would have been cultivated now but the Cape district.

1477. Are you prepared, as you have always kept up an intercourse and acquaintance with the Cape, to concur in the opinion given by the witnesses this day, as to the probability of an influx of emigrants being absorbed in the manner suggested by this Committee?—I can have no doubt of it; for, under every disadvantage, three or four thousand persons have been already absorbed since 1820.

1478. Do you not consider that, admitting the emigration were to take place this year, it might take place in future years on the principle suggested in the course of examination, the annual demand on the part of the colony being made known through the medium of a correspondence between the Cape and this country, so that only so much labour might be sent out as would meet the demand?—The details of any measure of that kind present considerable difficulty, and they vary with the circumstances of each colony. I am not prepared to say that perhaps the persons now resident in the Albany district are the best persons with whom you would negotiate for the supply of labour, but I have no doubt that persons employing their capital at the rate which has been proposed, that is, of paying 9*l.* to the labourer, and 3*l.* to government, would inevitably find it answer. In truth, when it is considered there has been an unfortunate visitation of providence, in the blight of the corn for three successive years in a new district, it is not fair to argue from an accident, that such must be the case in the colony generally; I am quite convinced that if it had not been for that accidental blight, which was the principal disappointment, and some other collateral circumstances (I allude to certain measures of the colonial government, and to the change in regard to the township of Bathurst) the number of settlers sent out in 1820 and 1821 would now have constituted a well-conditioned, comfortable population in the district of Albany.

1479. Are you not of opinion that the principle of an emigration of labourers, who may ultimately be converted into small capitalists, is a sounder principle of emigration than encouraging artificially the emigration of capitalists?—If I understand the principle, I take it an emigration of capitalists would bring with it labour, for any capitalist applying his mind soundly to the subject, would find he could do nothing with mere money unless he got labour, and therefore an emigration of capitalists would in itself be an emigration of labour.

1480. Do you not think it aggravates the difficulty of emigration, if at the same time the capitalist and the labourer go out together; or is it not more natural that the capitalists should go where they choose, and then the supply of labour should be given afterwards?—As I understand the purpose of the emigration contemplated, it is to rid this country of a redundant population; that is the principal object. I do not think that any capitalist in this country, looking to the rest of the world, would select the Cape as the place upon which he would employ his capital, for undoubtedly the profitable return from the Cape is not so certain as it is

is in Canada and New South Wales; but I happen to conceive it to be more certain than others do. But if I am asked with a view to the emigration of persons whose labour is not wanted here, whether their labour is not wanted at the Cape, and will not be paid for, I should say in the affirmative, it is wanted, and will be paid for.

1481. Do you mean as unproductive labour, or as productive labour?—I consider that if labour in this country is so redundant that the individual is not employed he is unproductive in this country, and must be maintained from the labour of those who are employed and are productive; so that if the labourer or unemployed pauper in this country, who cannot be called productive, becomes an emigrant to the Cape, and produces his own maintenance, I hold him to be a productive labourer, as compared with the unproductive pauper in this country.

1482. Having heard the evidence of the last witness, who asserted that there would be a great demand for menial servants, meaning labourers for the household, which would be unproductive labour, and such as produced nothing from the land, will you have the goodness to state if in your opinion the emigrant would be employed as a productive labourer at the Cape?—I must take the liberty to suggest, that I would correct the last witness; for in a country where you send a number of people to land that has nothing growing upon it, the menial servants you want are persons who will help you to grow something. Among the settlers who went out to the Cape, there were some who took out a small capital; while that capital lasted, they wanted food and servants, and food and servants were found them. Those who did not set to work as persons in a new country ought, soon got to the end of their capital, and there was an end to their means of purchasing food, and hiring servants; and what is much to be regretted, if they had not had the means of coming to this country, they must have remained paupers or labourers there.

1483. If you have no sale for your surplus produce, what interest would you have to grow any thing more than you yourself consumed?—If I were to admit the first part of that question, that there was no sale, it would be a different matter; but the fact is, that hitherto the population of the colony has been so sparse and inadequate to the extent of the soil, that it is quite out of the question to say what would be the exports of the colony.

1484. What are they?—The exports are various; among them corn, when the colony is not visited by the blight. The year before I arrived at the Cape had been a bad year: we were obliged to send to India and other places for a supply of corn; but before it arrived, the prospect of next year was such, that actually in that year there was a considerable exportation of wheat from the Cape to the Mauritius and to South America. It is in the knowledge of the Committee, that two years ago, when various schemes were going forward, and every one was contemplating the formation of companies, the Cape was selected as a place susceptible of agricultural speculation to a certain amount, in the same manner as Australia; I was not surprised that the scheme did not go forward, for His Majesty's government were so tenacious of the productive acres at the Cape, they would not grant them, except under severe conditions; they attached so much value to these acres, that a million of them at the Cape was thought a most monstrous demand, 500,000 would not be given, 200,000 were quibbled about. But it was the opinion of capitalists, that the scheme would have taken precisely the same character as the Australian Company has. If it had been supposed that there would be no export, certainly the capitalists never could have contemplated employing themselves upon what was not to yield an export, as in no other shape could they have got a return for their capital. I have mentioned this project, because it shows that all persons do not entertain the opinion that there can be no export from the Cape. To that proposition was subscribed the names of those persons who had had the best means of estimating the value of land at the Cape.

1485. Has not the tendency to export, even under the high prices at the Cape, been such, that government has been obliged to prohibit exportation?—Certainly; it was, in my opinion, a very mistaken policy on the part of government, and a policy which, when in office there, I very much contested, for if upon a notion of scarcity you are to prohibit export, it is quite conclusive, that the prohibition of export will be the prohibition of cultivation.

1486. It has been stated, the price of wheat at Cape Town is in British money and in British measure, 80s. per quarter; is that so?—I don't recollect any such price; perhaps some other gentlemen do, who are more conversant with the sub-

Henry Ellis,
Esq.

17 March,
1827.

Henry Ellis,
Esq.

17 March,
1847.

ject; but about ten six dollars the muid was considered as a remunerating price during my stay in the colony.

1487. How is that price of wheat at Cape Town consistent with the assertion, that there is a redundancy of supply in Albany?—I cannot conceive how that can be, where there are no markets regularly established. Supposing a market not to be regularly established, and one individual to have been particularly successful in his crop, and to have a redundancy, as far as the consumption of his own family went, if there were no market established in the district to which he could send his redundant corn, he would be in the case of a person having too much corn; yet there would not be a general redundancy. It is the absence of a local market in a new settlement I am speaking of. In a new settlement, a man who has a garden will not be able, immediately, to find a market for his surplus vegetables, there is nobody near him to buy them, and the vegetables must be left to rot in the ground. It is impossible, in the first formation of a settlement, for markets and every thing to be established at once; therefore any redundancy of supply which may be alleged to have existed in Albany, must have been an accidental or insulated redundancy.

1488. Would not the progressive increase of the population tend more to correct that consequence than any other circumstance?—Undoubtedly; for an increase of population is generally followed by regular markets, and every man knows where to send the redundancy of what he grows, and to find a purchaser; but it is impossible for a man digging in his garden, in which he might have cultivated produce, to leave his garden and cattle, and a wife and family, with his basket in his hand, as he might in a street in London, and say, Who will buy my surplus carrots and vegetables; he is obliged to leave them perishing on the ground.

1489. You have stated, that if there were an additional supply of labour to the Cape, various productions might be raised in the colony; will you have the goodness to state what those productions are, besides grain?—These will be determined by the nature of the soil and climate. I do not profess myself to be either an agriculturist or a botanist, or a scientific person, but I have understood that every production of the temperate zone, and many of the tropical regions, can be grown at the Cape.

1490. In looking to an export market from the Cape, what are the countries to which you direct your attention?—Why, to the Isle of France, which is nearest, and to South America, and I think to India. I should also look to the fisheries, to supply the markets for salt fish, which exist in different parts of Europe and elsewhere; on the eastern coast of the Cape of Good Hope there is a species of fish in great quantities, nearly resembling the cod, which is capable of being salted; there would be salt fish, whale oil, wool, hides, corn, wine, dried fruit, and pretty much those productions that belong to the Mediterranean.

1491. What are the articles which you would propose at present to carry from the Cape to the Mauritius and the Isle of France, which are the markets for corn?—It certainly cannot be a very considerable market, for the population of the Isle of France is not great; but I have known merchants at the Cape send corn advantageously to the Mauritius and to the Brazils.

1492. Is not the vine susceptible of great improvement?—Undoubtedly it is; and as yet, whether it be in agriculture, or whether it be with respect to the vine, every thing in the Cape has marked the want of capital, the want of knowledge, and the want of labour. But I beg leave to modify my opinion, by saying, that I do not for an instant compare the capabilities of the Cape, for the absorption of population, with Canada; I only go to the extent of saying, that it is capable of a certain absorption of population, not the least in proportion to its apparent geographical extent, but in proportion to those parts of it which are capable of arable cultivation; there is a great deal of land not capable, from the aridity of the soil, of being useful for any thing but pasturage; and it remains to be tried, whether it will grow any grass but the indigenous grass of the colony; no experiment has been made by introducing different sorts of grass, so that I cannot say what is its capability for pasturage.

1493. How long did you reside there?—Two years. I may say with respect to Albany, I went up there, and my duty was to locate the settlers, to place them in the grounds allotted to them, when the emigration took place in 1820. I saw that part of the country; my evidence must therefore be taken as the evidence of a person who applied his mind, while at the spot, for a year and a half, but whose personal knowledge of the details cannot be great.

1494. Has

1494. Has not the Dutch part of the colony been settled under disadvantageous circumstances?—It was settled in reference entirely to the advantage of individuals applying for grants of land, and without any reference to the capability of the colony for maintaining the population.

1495. Were not settlers permitted to make choice of spots very much where they liked, with reference to water and so on, without general reference to one situation or another?—Clearly so, in the early part of the settlement.

1496. And by that means, was not an intermediate space left unsettled?—Yes.

1497. How many labourers would be immediately absorbed this season, without injury to the colony?—I should say, that this season, considering the vicissitudes of the crops that have lately occurred at the Cape, and the general discouragement produced there, it would not be safe to make the experiment beyond 100 families, at the most.

1498. Is it of material consequence that there should be a number of children, or as few as possible?—In a new country the fewer helpless people you have, the better; and if you take a child, it is not right to calculate he can make any return under 10 years of age; you must have some; there would be little risk of health; the return of deaths of the colonists in the new settlement, from the emigration of 1820 and 1821, I should suppose has not exceeded the average mortality of places in any part of the world; I do not know that it has exceeded the average in the rest of the colony.

1499. Do you consider the climate as prejudicial to children?—Quite the contrary; it is impossible for any climate to be more favourable to the human constitution than the Cape of Good Hope.

1500. What is the ordinary drink of labourers at the Cape?—Wine, generally.

1501. Are you of opinion that there would be no danger in sending to the Cape this year a well assorted emigration, consisting of 100 men, 100 women, and 300 children?—I think not, on the principles which I know are contemplated by this Committee.

1502. Do you concur with the opinions given in the course of the examination to-day, that for the future a system may be adopted, by which the real demand of the colony may be regularly supplied?—I have no doubt it may, and the result will be, the increased cultivation of the colony, and with that, the increased prosperity of its inhabitants.

1503. And a progressive increased demand for labour?—I should think so, as a necessary consequence; I think increased prosperity involves a progressive demand for labour.

1504. When you say you have no doubt this emigration may be absorbed, do you mean to convey an idea, that the money laid out in sending them, would be gradually repaid by their employers by instalments, under the system of indentures?—I should think every part of the repayment would be made. Applying myself to the Cape, of which I know more than of other colonies, I think the period should be extended as long as possible; if the persons who engaged with them, and took them under those indentures, were persons of industrious habits themselves, and lived as men in a new country ought to do, that is, with the necessities and few of the luxuries of life, I have no question but that it would be repaid in the course of five or seven years, that is, 3*l.* a year, paying so much less to the wages. The ground of it is this: I take the price of slave labour in the Cape; a ploughman would get from 15 to 20 *rix* dollars per month; at the time I was there it was 20 dollars, about 2*l.*; 15 *rix* dollars would be 30*s.*; he was fed besides, and he was clothed partially; they are not persons who work very hard; free labour, at the rate of 12*l.* a year, would be considerably less; my calculation for the slave was 18*l.* a year, besides his food and some clothes; if it answered for the purpose of the people to give 18*l.* a year with food and some clothes to a slave, I cannot conceive it should not answer giving 12*l.* to a free labourer.

1505. The question is, whether from your knowledge of the Cape, under the circumstances which have been supposed to-day, you could undertake to recommend the incurring of preliminary expense, with the probability of ultimate repayment by instalments?—The way in which I would answer it would be this; if I were engaged in a company, I very much doubt if I should make my experiment at first with 100 families, I should be inclined to make the experiment with 50 families; but when I consider that this is a great national measure, I have no hesitation in saying, that one hundred families might be safely sent out there; for I conceive you have the great object in view of getting rid of unemployed persons here, and it is not a simple debtor and creditor account.

Henry Ellis,
Esq.17 March,
1827.

1506. Now, without looking to repayment at all, would not that population sent out, be more easily absorbed?—Unquestionably; I believe if there were no repayment at all, the population would be better there than here.

1507. If therefore no repayment is looked for by the parties going out, or the persons who took them there, will not a larger number of population be absorbed?—I have mentioned 100 families, and I certainly would not, under the actual circumstances of the colony, go beyond 100 families; and if it were not a national measure, I would say a smaller number would be a safer experiment.

1508. Would you say that you think this Committee might be recommended to encourage Government to send out emigrants to that amount?—I would say the Committee might safely recommend to Government to send 100 families out.

1509. In the new settlements of the Capé, is the intercourse carried on entirely by barter, or is there any currency in circulation?—As the new settlement forms part of an old established colony, the currency in the colony has necessarily found its way more or less into that new settlement, for there was a certain sum of money deposited by the settlers who went out in 1820-21, and these deposits, repayable upon the spot, in this new settlement, put them in ample possession of colonial currency.

1510. Is there then a certain amount of currency in circulation?—Yes.

1511. Was the 18*l.* which you calculated to be paid to the slave, in money or provisions?—I was taking a case; I was supposing a man with a farm, who wanted to hire a farm servant, and not owning a slave himself, to go to a person having a slave, he would give that in money to the person who supplied him; but I was applying myself to the old established districts of the colony, where there existed that slave population.

Martis, 20^a die Martii, 1827.

Mr. William Spencer Northhouse, being again called, delivered in the following Paper, which was read.

Mr.
W. S. Northhouse.20 March,
1827.

" Honourable Sir,

" London, 19th March 1827.

" WE beg, through your medium, to lay before the Honourable Committee on Emigration, a few Extracts from letters written by Settlers in Upper Canada to their friends, at various periods; we believe the persons writing are all known to Captain Marshall, to whom we would refer you. These extracts prove, to a moral certainty, that capital invested in the proposed undertaking is secure of a return.

" Grateful for the attention already paid to our requests, we are loath to press for a premature decision; but—the feverish anxiety under which the petitioners are suffering, the prospect of the season passing away, when preparations should be making to facilitate embarkation; the accounts we daily receive, of the continued distress of many, and the anticipated destruction of most; the certainty, that in two short months a crisis will arrive, when the petitioners will be rendered incapable of availing themselves of any future grant, and whatever is determined upon this Spring must either rescue them from misery or plunge them into absolute despair—renders this suspense almost intolerable, and induces us to beseech the Committee to bring its proceedings, in our case, to a speedy conclusion.

" We are, Honourable Sir,

" Your obedient humble Servants,

" The Hon. R. J. W. Horton,
 &c. &c. &c."

" John Tait,
" James Wilson.
" W. S. Northhouse."

EXTRACTS:

From Andrew Angus to his Parents.

" Lanark Township, 24 Lot, 10 Concession, 12 January 1822.

" . . . For my part I like the country very well; and I think any one who has a mind to work pretty hard for two years, may look forward to something like independence, as we can perceive by those who came here three years ago. Mr. Gemmil nor I ever had an hour's sickness. The summer is a great deal warmer than with you, but not intolerable; the winter is very cold, particularly at night and morning, but from ten until four afternoon we can work with coat and vests off at chopping down trees, which is very pleasant work. . . .

This

This country produces excellent potatoes, Indian corn, wheat, and in fact almost every thing a family needs, besides a number of luxuries. We are worst off for clothes, until we be able to raise sheep and lint; both thrive well here; indeed the wool is said to be equal to the Merino. - - -

The larger a family is that comes out here, has the most advantage of doing well; there are some that came out in 1820, with six children, and without a farthing but government allowance, bought two cows, and maintained themselves on their land until they raised crop sufficient. - - -

If trade is no better in Glasgow, you could not do better than come out; if the country was not in the highest degree healthy, I would not advise you to come out. - - -

June 2d, 1824.

" - - - I wish you had come out here at the time I came, as by this time you would have been out the reach of dull trade and high markets, except as a seller. There were none about us but what had a good deal to dispose of; for my own part, last year I raised as much provision as would have done me for two years; we had a good ready market for our flour at the mill we got it ground at (about fifteen miles from where we live) erected by Captain Robertson for the use of the emigrants he brought out. [*Having been badly with the fever and ague, &c proceeds.*] However, my work did not fall behind, there was an acre and a half which I had not got cut down, notice was given me there were some coming to chop it out on such a day, which they did; then I had no more to do than to send word I wanted it piled up for burning, when about thirty men turned out and logged off about three acres in one day; others came in and put in my crop; in fact, I am further forward with my work than any of my neighbours, which is always the case when one has trouble; the neighbours will turn out from six to eight miles to forward their work; but sickness is very scarce in this settlement. I wish you would all come out if you could; I could not advise you with so much confidence before, but I see now that any family coming out, and able to support themselves until they raise the first crop, have always plenty of provisions afterwards."

April 18, 1825. "This place has been settled little more than three years, and some that left Scotland with nothing, have now from 12 to 18 head of cattle, besides sheep and hogs. This township grows a great deal of wheat and Indian corn of the best quality; my own crops have always turned out remarkably well; this year I had as much flour as would have done me three years, besides a great deal of other grain. I planted five quarts of Indian corn, the produce of which was 50 bushels, and that is not thought a great crop; from seven bushels of potatoes I had 240 bushels. To give you some idea how this township has come on; we have an annual meeting, where we choose our office-bearers; I was appointed assessor, I had to go to every house to take an account of clear land, number of inhabitants and cattle; there are 1560 people, 95 oxen about four years old, 180 under four and above two years old, 338 milk cows, and more than 1000 under two years old. The taxes, which all go for school and bridges, are trifling, 3d. for every milk cow, 4d. for every ox above four years, and 1d. for every acre of clear land."

From William Davis, to his Sons and Daughters.

"Dalbeth Township of Ramsey, 25th November 1821.

" - - - I AM now come to that part of my letter, where I must give you my own opinion of this place, which is shortly this: Were I to get a gift of a free house and shop in Parkhead, and one hundred pounds beside, I would not exchange, I value my present situation more than that. I can see men here, who have not been more than two or three years on their land, who have now three head of cattle, and forty fowls about their doors, and living in the greatest plenty. Now only compare this scene with that of the weavers at home, and you will be able to judge for yourselves. We would all be pleased exceedingly, were every one of you to come to this place; should you do so, I will do every thing in my power to make you comfortable; by next fall or harvest, I think I should have provisions enough to satisfy all our wants, God being willing to prosper our crops."

10 July 1825. "We are enjoying most excellent health; our crops last year were abundant, of which we have a surplus; the crop this season looks well so far as it is gone; my cleavage contains 4 acres of wheat, 1½ acre of oats, 1 acre of Indian corn, 1 acre of barley, 1 acre of peas, ½ acre of turnips, 1 acre of potatoes,

Mr.
W. S. Northouse.
20 March,
1827.

potatoes, and the rest in hay for winter feed for the cattle, which consist of 2 cows, 2 young oxen rising 3 years old, 2 of last year, and 2 of this year, making in all 8 head of cattle; add to this 1 hog, 1 cow, which we expect will have a litter of pigs; the cocks and hens are the same number as that regiment often tried and never found to fail, 42, which supply us with abundance of eggs." - - -

From William McMillan to his Children in Cambruslog.

" Dalhousie, 24th August 1822.

" We are very much surprised that you have neglected the opportunity Government has given in sending out families to this place; it appears to us to be like the parable, ' When the dinner was ready, for excuse, the one had married, the other building a house, &c.' I am afraid you will never get such another opportunity; I wish you were all here, we would soon be happy; we like the place well, and the governor, Colonel Marshall, is a very fine gentleman. There is no inconvenience from summer's heat or winter's cold, I can work in winter with my coat off throughout the day. Be sure to embrace the first opportunity of coming here."

From James Dobie, to his Father and Friends.

" Lunark, U. C. 24 April 1826.

" - - - I and my family are still taking well with this country; and I really do bless God every day I rise, that He was ever pleased in the course of His providence to send me and my family to this place. We are not without difficulties here, but they are nothing in comparison to your wants in Glasgow; we have always had plenty to eat and drink, and have always had a little to spare. Next to my own happiness, I wish you were here; I wish you would try and do all you can to come out; you will find plenty of work, and hard work, but be assured it will pay you, and that well. My stock of cattle consists of one yoke of oxen, three milk cows, and three young ones. I have got up a very handsome new house, with the assistance of fifteen young men; it was raised in one day; it is 24 feet in length, and 15 in breadth. Col. Marshall will be in Glasgow; call upon him, and he will give you his opinion of this place."

June 26, 1826. To his Cousin.—" Would to God, my dear friend, that you and all my friends were here with us; by labouring on the land, you would be independent of trade, and, with the blessing of God, you would always have plenty to eat and drink, which, with health, makes life a pleasure. We have always had plenty since we came here, for ourselves, and have still sold more or less every year. Our superintendent, Col. Marshall, is going home, it is said, to bring out emigrants to be settled in two townships in Lower Canada; now you should do all you can to try and get out, let nothing hinder you, if possible! All this settlement is striving to do well; were you here, and seeing the improvements that are going on amongst us, you would not believe that we were once Glasgow weavers."

Peter Munro to John McLaughlin.

" Dalhousie, 6 May 1824.

" - - - If it had been so ordered that you had come here when I came, you would, by being industrious, have had plenty to eat of the best flour, Indian corn, and potatoes, and to drink of the best milk, maple sap, molasses and honey. Last harvest, I had in 140 bushels of potatoes, besides grain of all sorts. You may depend upon it we had a number of difficulties, but now they are almost over; yet we may still expect to meet with losses and crosses. Last January, I lost one of my large oxen, yet providence has always been kind to me; the first two calves I had were oxen, they are now three years old, and are able to do the most of my work. I have got a large house built, 20 feet by 30, and a barn 20 feet by 40."

27th November 1826. To the Same.—" We hear there will be an extensive immigration next Spring; I would seriously advise you, as a friend, to enrol your name and family among them as early as possible; and, for your encouragement, I will tell you, upon my arrival at Greenock from Paisley, depending on a certain friend for the supply of a few pounds to pay my passage, I was disappointed; but there were a few more in the same predicament; we were, in all, 274 short, but raised the sum by subscription. We then got orders to put our luggage aboard. John, I never was happier in my life than with that order; and now, have I not reason? - - -"

Robert

*Robert Fleming to a Friend.*Mr.
W. S. Northhouse.

" Lanark (U. C.) 24th April 1825.

20 March,
1827.

" - - - I AM still making it better. I have about eight acres of land bearing crop, and two more making ready. I have two cows giving milk, a yoke of oxen, a two-year old steer, and a young bull; we keep pigs, which yield us plenty of pork. I had as much wheat last year as would keep my family for two years; what I did not need I sold, and bought clothes with to my family. - - -"

William Anderson to his Mother.

" Ramsay Township, 16th July 1825.

" - - - You are very anxious to be with me, but I doubt you would not be able to stand the fatigue of the passage. If you were here, I could keep you pretty comfortable. I have been exceeding fortunate in getting good land and good crops. I have plenty of provisions to live upon, and a little to spare. I have built a new house in the centre of my lot, on a rising ground, and were my ground cleared I could see from the house the four corners of my lot. Crops look well this season. The clearing of the land is nothing to me; all is, how to plant and reap. I have two milk-cows and a young one rising two year old, two spring calves, and a yoke of oxen, which make seven head of cattle; and we have seven hogs. I have got 18 acres all under crop with grain and hay. - - -"

In addition to and corroborating the above accounts, there are letters from William Allan, Hugh Wallace, William Hay, Robert Park, in the township of Dalhousie; James Leitch, Ramsay James Smith, in North Sherbrook; and a number of others, written to their friends in Glasgow and neighbourhood. Almost all of them were bred to manufactures, particularly weaving, and went out with the assistance of government during the years 1820 and 1821.

*William Bowman Felton, Esq. again called in; and Examined.*W. B. Felton,
Esq.

1512. AN Estimate has been given in to the Committee, according to which, the expense for food for an emigrant family of five persons, at the Cape of Good Hope, is calculated at 7*l.* 10*s.*, being only for six months; by comparing that with the Canada estimate already printed, it is perceived that the Canada estimate extends to sixteen months, and that the expense is calculated at 28*l.*; will you state to the Committee the reasons for this difference, or rather the necessity for that prolonged duration of rations at the Canadas?—It must be first observed that the Canada estimate is founded on an experience on a very extended scale, and it has been discovered that the promise of a smaller supply of provisions than twelve months would be illusory, the greater part of the first twelve months would be lost before a settler could prepare his land for a crop, in consequence of the necessity of removing the timber before the land is ready to receive the seed; and that being the case, no return can be depended upon until the end of the next harvest; therefore assuming that the settler arrives in the Canadas in the middle of summer, and leaving Great Britain on the 1st of April, he cannot well reach Upper Canada before the month of May is consumed; it will occupy the remainder of the summer to prepare the ground for a crop to be put in the succeeding spring; if the settlers are dispatched from Europe in the course of the summer, it will be the month of August, or early in September, before they will arrive in the colony, and then the two months open weather before the winter sets in is barely sufficient for them to build their huts to shelter them from the inclemency of the weather, and to prepare the ground for the succeeding spring's cropping; now under the latter circumstances which are thus contemplated by the Committee, it will be most assuredly twelve months before any return can be received from the labours of the settlers. The Committee distinctly understand that there are no lands whatever in the British colonies denuded of wood; the only districts in the North American hemisphere clear of wood, are at present too remote to furnish a place of location for our emigrant population.

1513. Are there no tracts of land, such as the Americans call Prairies?—None in the Canadas; the Prairies are confined to the northern bank of the river Ohio, and are not the most profitably cultivated lands after all.

W. B. Folson,
Esq.30 March,
1847.

1514. You think, therefore, that any estimate would be fallacious, which did not take into consideration the maintenance of the settlers for a period of a year, and possibly for a period of fifteen or sixteen months!—To attempt to carry on a settlement on a large scale, without ensuring the settlers provision for twelve months at least, would assuredly be attended with disappointment. In respect of the difference in the expense of provision mentioned in the two estimates, it is to be observed, that according to the calculations of the gentleman from the Cape of Good Hope, beef, which is the basis of the diet proposed for the settlers, is almost valueless, whereas provision of all descriptions in the Canadas usually sells for a price relative to the producing it; that is an advantage which ultimately the settlers will profit greatly by. The second or third series of settlers arrive in March, and contribute to enable the first established settlers to pay a large proportion of the sum advanced to their maintenance, by their purchasing of them their productions; but if provisions remain at the present price at the Cape, I do not see any prospect of their selling their surplus to advantage. I am so convinced of the certainty of agricultural produce obtaining a remunerating price in the Canadas, that upon that I ground my project for the repayment for the provisions which shall be advanced to the settlers, conceiving that if the government receives in kind the provisions it lends to the settlers, they will always be enabled to convert them into money, if they are not disposed to distribute them among the new coming settlers. I will take the liberty of submitting to the Committee my proposition upon that subject.

[*The Witness delivered in the same; which was read, as follows:*]

PLAN for the repayment of the Provisions furnished to the Emigrants, after their arrival at the place of location.

Each Family of five persons to be allowed to take up from the public store provisions for 15 months (consisting of flour or meal, pork, and molasses or sugar, as in the Table of Rations) the quantity being left to the discretion of the emigrant, but not to exceed in value 40s. for each month; so that the whole supply, if required, estimated at 3 rations per diem, including seed grain and potatoes, will be - - - - -

Interest on 30 <i>l.</i> at 5 per cent, for five years - - -	£ 30 - -
	7 10 -
	£ 37 10 -

In case the emigrant does not take up to the full extent of the allowance, he shall be charged only with the value of the actual supply.

In the event of the emigrant repaying one-half of the amount (say 15*l.*) before the expiration of five years, he shall be allowed three years more in which to repay the remaining moiety, and the whole sum thus liquidated shall be free of interest.

If he defers repayment until the expiration of five years, he shall be charged with the principal sum advanced, and the accumulated interest thereon, the whole forming a lien on his estate; and at the end of the sixth year, the interest on the principal (1*l.* 10s.) to be exacted, and payment thereof to be required annually, always subject to the deduction correspondent to that portion of the capital (30*l.*) which he may repay in the interval.

The repayment of principal and interest to be made in produce; viz. pork or grain at the prices fixed for those articles at the time of the advance being made, grain being taken at its relative value in respect to flour or meal, and the emigrant to be allowed the option of paying money either in whole or in part.

At the end of nine years the settler shall be required to pay 20 per cent, or one-fifth of the debt (37*l.* 10s.) and so on annually until the whole is repaid, which will thus be accomplished in six years.

TABLE OF RATIONS.			s.	d.
1 $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of flour or meal, a'	-	-	-	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
$\frac{1}{2}$ lb. of pork, a'	-	-	-	2
2 oz. of molasses or sugar	-	-	-	$\frac{1}{2}$
				5 $\frac{1}{2}$
3 rations allowed for 5 persons; viz.				
1 man, 1 woman, 3 children	-	-	3	
			1	5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per diem.

Table of Rations—continued.

60 weeks rations, at 1/3 4 per diem	-	-	£. 27	11	3
Seed grain and potatoes	-	-	-	2	8 9
			£. 30	-	-
Viz. 2 bushels wheat, at 5/	-	£. -	10	-	-
5 bushels oats, at 2/	-	-	10	-	-
10 bushels potatoes, at 2/6	-	1	5	-	-
Indian corn and grass seed	-	-	3	9	-
		£. 2	8	9	.

W. S. Follen,
Esq.20 March,
1827.

Mr. David Polley Francis, being again called in, delivered in the following Paper, which was read :

ESTIMATE for the Transport from *England*, to *Algoa Bay* and the Location within 100 miles of that Port, of a Family of Emigrants, consisting of two Adults and three Children.

Mr.
D. P. Francis.
20 March,
1837.

	£.	s.	d.
Passage out, including Freight, Provisions, Water,			
Fuel and Birthing - - - - -	36	-	-
Waggon-hire for 100 miles - - - - -	3	3	-
2 pair Blankets - - - - -	-	15	-
Furniture and Cooking Utensils - - - - -	1	10	-
Mechanical Implements - - - - -	1	-	-
Farming Implements - - - - -	1	-	-
Seed Wheat, Maize, Potatoes, Garden Seeds - - - - -	2	-	-
1 Cow - - - - -	1	-	-
3 Milch Goats - - - - -	-	12	-
Six months Provisions, allowing 5 lbs. Butcher's meat per day for the Family, and 1 d. per head for Bread and Vegetables - - - - -	7	10	-
	£. 54	10	-

N. B. No allowance is made for building a house, as every man able to wield an axe may erect a comfortable shelter in three days; but it would be expedient to allow every family a tent for two or three weeks at first, to secure them, in case of wet weather.

1515. You have heard the evidence given by Mr. Felton, with regard to the necessity of from twelve to sixteen months provisions in Canada; will you state what are the circumstances of difference between that settlement and the Cape, which, in your judgment, render it necessary at the latter to provide only six months provisions?—Never having been in Canada, I cannot speak to that; I can speak only as to the Cape. I conceive that if a settler arrives at a proper season, that is, in April, and is immediately placed upon his land, he will in the course of six months be able to raise sufficient to sustain himself.

1516. At what time of the year would it be necessary for a settler to leave England, to be located at an hundred miles from the place of landing in April?—It would take about fourteen weeks; I mean from the port of embarkation in the United Kingdom to Algoa Bay or to his location.

1517. You mean including the time necessary for his being settled there?—Yes.

1518. In order to land at the end of April, he must leave England by the beginning of January?—Yes, he must.

1519. Do you conceive that the risk and expense accompanying the transport would not be considerably increased by the necessity of making a winter passage?—No, because immediately after they leave England they get into fine weather, and they would arrive there in the summer or the beginning of autumn.

1520. At what time would the settler begin to sow his seed, so as to prepare for the following harvest?—He might immediately prepare, and sow the latter end of May and beginning of June.

1521. What crop would he put into the ground?—I should recommend maize.

1522. At what time is that crop reaped at the Cape?—The latter end of August or the commencement of September; I am speaking of Indian corn or maize, if planted at the time mentioned.

1523. Are there any impediments in the nature of the land to bringing it into immediate cultivation?—None; there is no clearing required; the land is generally open.

1524. Do you conceive there is no risk or contingency about the crops, which would render it expedient, on an average, to make a greater provision for the settlers?—There is certainly a risk about wheat crops, in consequence of the blight which has prevailed; but with regard to maize, vegetables, and pumpkins, which are a great resource there, there is no risk, and there is little or no risk in barley.

1525. Have you in your contemplation any particular district in which you should recommend the settlement of any number of emigrants?—If it is to be

Mr.
D. P. Frensis.
30 March,
1847.

located, I should recommend the ceded territory between the Great Fish river and Keishamma.

1526. Are you well or at all acquainted with the nature of that country?—I have been over what I consider the best part of it.

1527. Is it entirely clear of timber?—Where they would wish to grow grain it is perfectly so.

1528. Would there be any difficulty in procuring materials to build the log-houses for the settlers?—None whatever; such timber as is necessary to build the description of houses which have generally been built by the settlers, in most cases, grows immediately on the spot, or in kloofs or ravines; there is no heavy timber, but in those situations.

1529. What are the sorts of timber?—There is a great variety; there is timber of all descriptions, of the most useful kinds; there is a yellow wood, which is something approaching to fir, but harder.

1530. Is that like teak?—No, there is no teak; there are a variety of hard woods, stunk woods, &c.

1531. Is the country of which you speak well watered?—The part of which I speak is well watered, probably better than most other in the colony.

1532. Can you state generally the extent of the district?—That district, I conceive, contains upwards of 1,500,000 acres.

1533. All unoccupied?—Yes, all unoccupied; one million acres of which, I conceive, might be located to very great advantage.

1534. Is it not liable to incursions from the Caffres?—It is; it lies bordering upon the Caffres; but I apprehend, if there was an European establishment upon a proper footing, those incursions would not take place so frequent.

1535. What quantity of land should you propose to give to each settler?—The quantity of land, I think, should vary according to the situation. In that district I would recommend villages, in the first instance, to be established; to give them a small portion of ground to each family, such as from two to four acres as garden ground, and then for their cattle should feed in common, because it would be necessary, perhaps, for them to be in a body.

1536. You mean for the purpose of protection?—Yes.

1537. Is it to this district you have calculated an hundred miles of waggon conveyance?—It would be more than an hundred miles to the part I have mentioned. When I made that calculation it was with reference to other lands; I merely made it as a general estimate.

1538. What would you add to the estimate, for the purpose of meeting the increased distance?—I would add fifty miles, or thereabouts.

1539. Then half as much again as is set down would do for the conveyance?—Yes.

1540. Is the nature of the country such as, in the absence of roads, to be easily accessible?—Yes, quite so; the natural roads are very good, if they can be so called.

1541. Upon what are the remaining items of the expense put down by you, calculated?—The implements I have estimated upon the prices in England; the cow, at the price in the Cape.

1542. You do not suppose that the demand for labour in other parts of the settlement would have the effect of drawing away settlers after their six months were out?—I think it would not have that effect, they would find themselves so well off after an establishment of twelve months, that they would not be induced to leave.

1543. Would there be any inducement in the high price of free labour in the neighbourhood of the Cape?—No, I think not; this would be at a distance of 700 miles from the Cape.

1544. You have stated, you thought the tribes in the neighbourhood would not attack an European settlement; on what ground do you state that?—I found my opinion on what I have known to be the case in the colony; the Dutch boers, who are the old colonists, and the natives, have always lived on very bad terms; but the natives have generally shown a disposition to be much more friendly towards the English, and I conceive, with a proper system adopted, one of mildness and firmness, there would be a lucrative barter trade carried on, to mutual advantage.

1545. You think with that system, they would be in no danger?—Yes, that is my opinion.

1546. Upon

1546. Upon what ground have you made a reduction from your evidence on Saturday, in the expense for a family, from 45*l.* to 36*l.*?—What I mentioned on Saturday, I then took at what was allowed to the settlers when they went out in 1820; they were fed very differently; this estimate is with reference to Mr. Buchanan's plan of feeding them.

1547. Would not those settlers have considerable difficulty in obtaining clothing for themselves?—They would generally be clothed in skins, which they would tan themselves, such as their sheep and goat skins; that is the general clothing of the Boers, and that description of persons in the interior.

1548. With what growth is the surface of the country at present covered?—Grass of two descriptions; there is a sweet and a sour grass.

1549. In calculating your expense to the Cape, have you taken the same estimate of the number of passengers to the ton, which Mr. Buchanan has taken to the North American Colonies?—Yes.

1550. Do not you conceive, from the difference of climate, they must make some difference in the room allowed, and also some difference in the amount of provisions, which must be calculated on?—I think there should not be quite so many to a ton to the Cape as to the North American Colonies.

1551. In making your calculations as to the Cape, you perhaps omitted to take that into your consideration?—Yes, I did not think of that at the moment; it is very essential.

1552. That would make some difference in the expense, then?—Yes, a little; but not quite so much as may probably be conceived.

1553. Do you think as much provisions per day would be necessary in the passage to the Cape, as to the North American Colonies?—Yes; and it may be necessary to vary it, on account of climate.

Thomas Lacoste, Esq. called in; and Examined.

1554. WHERE do you reside?—At Chertsey, in Surrey.

1555. Have you any unemployed poor in your parish?—Yes, a good many.

1556. Can you state to the Committee at what rate they are paid?—I believe that, throughout the winter, we allow two shillings a head per week for a man, the same his wife, and eighteen-pence a head for the children.

1557. Do you set them to work on any thing?—Yes, we set them to digging gravel and skreening it, and breaking stones for the roads.

1558. Do you set them to work upon that, for the sake of employing them, or for the sake of any material profit?—Principally for the sake of employing them, and sometimes for the purpose of gravelling the roads; but those I speak of, who are allowed this money, have no work at all. Those who dig gravel, have a small pay from the parish.

1559. Supposing in that parish there were a man and his wife and three children utterly out of employ the whole year, and that the parish had to maintain them during that year; what is the expense at which you would estimate the maintenance of that family?—At 8*s.* 6*d.* a week.

1560. You think it could not be done at less money than that?—No.

1561. Do you include lodging in that?—They pay the rent themselves out of that sum.

1562. In point of fact, therefore, you estimate the 8*s.* 6*d.* a week to cover all the expenses those poor occasion to the parish?—Yes, except in case of any particular illness, when they are ordered wine by the surgeon. If it is a child at the breast, they do not allow so much as eighteen-pence a week for that.

1563. Supposing a proposition were to be made to your parish, of removing any of the poor unemployed families, do you think there would be a disposition on the part of the parish, from a sense of your own interests, to consent for ten years to an annuity of eight or ten pounds a year, if the consequence was to get rid of each pauper family absolutely?—I should have no doubt of it.

1564. You are not of opinion that the circumstance of charging the parish rates with a certain annuity for ten years, would not induce the parish to hesitate, inasmuch as those paupers might be employed elsewhere, or leave the parish, or find employment within the parish, in the course of ten years?—No, I think the parish would be glad to pay eight or ten pounds during the term of years mentioned, in order to get rid of them.

1565. You entertain no doubt that the proprietors, or those interested in the

Mr.
D. P. Francis.
20 March,
1827.

Thomas Lacoste,
Esq.

Thomas Lacoste,
Esq.
20 March,
1847.

subject of parochial rates in the parish in which you reside, would consent willingly to charge their parish rates with eight or ten pounds for several years, provided the paupers were removed, in a satisfactory manner, where they would be likely to succeed, and if they were deprived by law of the power of ever again being chargeable to that parish?—I have no doubt of it, provided there is a law to enable them to do it.

1566. You do not apprehend there would be any difficulty in raising the money, provided the parish rates were appropriated to the repayment?—There would be no difficulty at all, if there were legal facilities.

1567. From your general knowledge upon those subjects, do you conceive that parishes similarly circumstanced would generally be disposed to do the same thing?—I should really think so; there can be no doubt of it.

1568. Do you think that if the advantages which might be looked to in removing to a British colony, were explained to the paupers, some families would be induced to make the experiment?—I have no doubt of it.

1569. From your knowledge of the lower orders of people, do you know any men who are now making great efforts to avoid becoming burdensome to the parish?—Yes; I know there are in our parish several who have too much pride, if I may call it so, to become so, and who, though they are greatly distressed, still keep themselves from the parish.

1570. Do you know whether there are any description of labourers who at the commencement of the winter endeavour by every means in their power to find masters, rather than throw themselves on the parish?—Yes, certainly there are.

1571. Do those persons reside in the workhouse or in cottages?—In cottages.

1572. What would become of those cottages if those persons were removed?—I do not know; there are a great many that are mere mud cottages, not of any value, which if uninhabited would fall down within the course of a very few months.

1573. Would they be prevented being occupied by other persons?—I dare say there are a great many which have been built on the parish land by permission, and which would be pulled down by the parish.

1574. From your knowledge of the law of settlement, would it be possible for a poor married man to come into that parish and obtain a settlement?—No, for the rent would not be sufficient to enable them to do it.

1575. What is the population of your parish?—Between four and five thousand.

1576. How many families having settlements are now in the permanent receipt of two and twenty pounds a year from your parish?—I really do not know how many.

1577. Are there many families in the parish of Chertsey who are wholly on the parish, except during a few weeks in harvest?—Yes, there are several families.

1578. How many families, except during the harvest, live exclusively upon the parochial fund?—I cannot state the number, but I can state that we pay to people of this description about 110*l.* on an average, monthly.

1579. How long has this been the case?—I should think for seven or eight years about the same as it is now.

1580. Have you a select vestry in your parish?—Yes.

1581. Have you a poor-house in your parish?—Yes.

1582. How many paupers is it capable of containing?—The most that ever I remember in it were 128; we have now 65 in it; the last time we let it, we let the whole by the head at 3*s.* 6*d.* per week per head, but the select vestry have just made up their accounts, and they find it has cost them under their own management 3*s.* 1*d.*

1583. You say you pay to an able-bodied man and his wife 2*s.* a week, and the children 1*s.* 6*d.* a week; what does it cost in your poor-house?—3*s.* 1*d.*

1584. Are they let?—No, not now; they were at 3*s.* 6*d.* per head, but now the select vestry have taken completely the management of it, and they have reduced it to 3*s.* 1*d.*

1585. You never exercised the full legal authority of refusing relief to any pauper except in the poor-house?—No, I believe not.

1586. Has your pauper population increased of late years?—I think our out-pensioners, as we call them, are much the same as they have been for eight or nine years; the number in the poor-house is not so great as it was some years ago.

1587. Are you not of opinion that the parish would consider that though no family in the parish perhaps was chargeable absolutely the whole year, great relief would

22 March,
1827.

would arise from the removal of a certain number of families, and the condition of those who remain would be improved by it!—I should conceive an increase in consequence of the number of labourers we have; we never know the want of a man, even in hay or harvest; we have always as many as we want.

1588. Can you state the rental in your parish?—I think somewhere about 20,000*l.* or from that to 22,000*l.*

1589. What is the amount of the general outgoing for the whole of your parish?—Last year it was about 3,000*l.*

1590. In the proposition which has been made to you, it is necessary you should mark, that no emigrants would be removed who were not able-bodied and within certain ages, and capable of making settlers; are you of opinion that would prevent the parish coming into the proposition?—I think not.

1591. Are not the people who are supported in the poor-house generally the most idle?—Generally.

1592. What is the distribution of land in your parish, is it in large properties or small?—The largest landholder in the parish is the Crown, and next to that Mr. Holme Sumner; and others have large properties in the parish.

1593. Do you conceive that there is efficient control in the hands of the parish, and that that control is in the hands of persons who conceive it more their interest to diminish the poor rates than to receive a rent for their cottages?—I think there are many persons who would not care about the parish as long as they got their rents; with us we make it a rule never to pay any rent for a cottage.

1594. What is the rent of your cottages?—Generally from four pounds to six.

1595. How is it possible that a man who gets but eight and sixpence a week can pay that rent?—Very often they do not pay it at all, I believe.

1596. Are any of those houses which are occupied by paupers, the property of members of the select vestry?—Yes, certainly.

1597. Is the number considerable?—I cannot say whether the number is considerable.

1598. Do you think that the members of the select vestry who hold cottages, would be induced to reject this proposition, by the interest they have in letting their cottages?—Certainly not.

1599. Is it possible for a married poor man to obtain a settlement by any means coming into the parish and occupying one of those cottages?—No, certainly not, unless (which is done sometimes) he occupies two or three for the purpose of occupying to the extent of ten pounds a year, to make himself a parishioner; I know that at the time when bread and provisions were so high, we behaved much better to the poor of our parish than the neighbouring parishes, in consequence of which we had a great many parishioners made in our parish.

1600. Was not that previous to Mr. Bourne's Act, which made the whole of the rental necessary to be in the same parish?—Yes, it appears it was; I refer to a period about twelve years ago.

1601. In the event of any family coming into your parish, and occupying a cottage, and not being a parishioner, and requiring parochial relief, would not the parish instantly remove them?—Yes.

1602. You have stated, that the average rate which the paupers are paid in your parish, for a man and his wife and three children, is 8*s.* 6*d.* a week, and that he pays as well as he can his rent?—Yes.

1603. Do you know in what condition of life those paupers live?—They live very badly; many of them get nothing but bread and potatoes.

1604. Do they get tea?—Yes, they almost always get tea.

1605. Do they make out their rent by taking lodgers?—When the house is large enough; but a great many of them have got little mud cottages of their own.

1606. Can you explain to the Committee the reason why in the poor-house a greater expense appears to be incurred, than when the poor are relieved in their own houses?—No; except that, perhaps, a man who is out of the poor-house may occasionally earn sixpence or a shilling; and one thing is, that we wish more of these people to come into the house than he employed out of it.

1607. What has been the greatest number of persons receiving parish relief at any time within the last two years?—I do not know.

1608. Are wages paid out of the rates in your parish?—No, not now; they were formerly.

Mr. James Taylor, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
James Taylor.

20 March,
1897.

1609. WHERE do you reside?—At Feltham, in the county of Middlesex.

1610. Are you overseer of the poor?—Yes.

1611. Is there a select vestry?—No, it is an open vestry. I am assistant overseer.

1612. Have you a great many unemployed poor?—We have had during the winter; ours is a small parish, it consists only of two or three thousand; we have had a great deal of want of labour for the last two winters, more particularly owing to a good deal of vegetable being cultivated in our parish for the markets in London; there has been generally a want of labourers in the summer time, which has been supplied from other parishes, but in the winter we are generally very short of employment for our labourers.

1613. What is the principle on which you pay your unemployed poor?—When any come out to the parish for employment or relief, they are generally referred by myself, as overseer, to the surveyor of the roads for employment, and if he cannot give them employment I am obliged to give them relief. If it is a single man, they do not always give them a shilling a day; for working on the highways, or for digging the gravel and mending the roads, it may be five shillings a week; if he has a wife, he has a shilling a day; if he has a wife and one child, he has seven shillings a week; if he has a wife and two children, he has eight shillings; if he has a wife and three children, he has nine shillings, and so on to any number they have; there are one or two with six children, who have twelve shillings a week; that is about what we generally give to common labourers.

1614. Do those men work, that are so put upon the roads or the gravel pits?—They do not earn even the money they get of the surveyor, in the general way; they get into a low degraded way, and seem as if they did not care whether they did it or not, and it is with difficulty that we can get them even to do that; if we were to have this gravel dug by the load, at the price of sixpence a load, I think the parish would get more loads done for the money than they would by giving them a shilling a day.

1615. Except during the month of harvest, you have not the same families always on the parish?—We have two or three, ours being a small parish, who have been so nine months out of the twelve, for the last two or three years, just going out at haymaking, and continuing off till the harvest, and then returning again to the pit; and we have been so full of these kind of hands during the winter, that we came to a resolution this year not to have any gravel carried on by carts, but to wheel it on by hand.

1616. For how many miles?—Our parish, from beginning to end, is very nearly three miles.

1617. Why do not those hands, who you say are on the parish nine months out of the twelve, get into the gardens in the summer?—There are some who may do so for a little while; there are some who do not get employment, owing to their deficiency of character; and it gets into a kind of settled opinion, that in a parish of this kind, the men, after they have been on the parish in this kind of way for some time, get naturally indolent, and then they could not get recommended; people will not employ men who have been a good while on the parish, they suppose they get into an idle habit, and careless about every thing.

1618. How many cottages do you pay the rent of?—We have belonging to the parish, as parish property, thirteen rooms or houses. Men who have three children seem to think they have a kind of right to a room in the parish, that it gives them, by custom, a kind of right.

1619. For how many cottages do you pay rent in addition?—It comes to about 50*l.* a year at 2*s.* a week, that would be about ten.

1620. At what would you estimate the expense of a family, of a man, a woman, and three children, who were out of employment all the year, and whom the parish were obliged to support, and for whose work there was no real demand?—We have no such case as that, but I can easily state what it would come to; we should allow a man and his wife five shillings, and for every child they had they would be allowed one additional shilling or eighteen pence; the larger number they have got the smaller is the allowance made, because they are messing together.

1621. You have heard Mr. Larcose mention the idea he entertains of the probable inclination of the parish of Chertsey to agree to remove some of the pauper families; have you any families whom it would be desirable to remove on similar

similar terms?—There are several of them I think it would be economical and politic to remove, and very desirable for the individuals, if they were placed in the circumstances which have been represented.

Mr.
James Taylor.

20 March,
1827.

1622. Do you think the vestry of your parish would be disposed to charge their rates with from eight to ten pounds a year, for ten years, to get rid absolutely and for ever of families in the proportion of a man, a woman, and three children, for every eight or ten pounds so mortgaged?—It is very difficult for a man to give the mind of the parish. I believe that most people who know much about vestries, know there are widely different opinions, as men are differently situated; some are proprietors and occupiers, another is only a proprietor of a small property, another is a large occupier and no proprietor at all, and their interests operate differently on their minds; one farmer has a lease about to expire, and he does not care if the rates run up a little, for he can make a better bargain with his landlord; on the other hand, another has just made his lease afresh for 21 years, "Now, he says, we must be most rigidly economical;" and these things make people speak differently in a vestry, accordingly to their different situations.

1623. You, as overseer, are enabled probably to represent, in some degree, the feelings of the parish; what do you say about the propriety of consenting to these terms?—This plan, as stated to me by an honourable member of the Committee, I think is one for the benefit of the people (I was going to say interested) in the parish, and likewise of the poor themselves; a very good one, both in point of policy and in point of utility. I will say, as overseer, there are some people who say, "I have got no work and no money;" leaving out of consideration those who are not able, we cannot give them work, we must employ them. There are many who would rather live a dog's life, hungry and easy, than stick to work and have something more; those I call the lower order—the destitute almost. There are two descriptions of poor; I distinguish them by the prodigate and the industrious poor. There is one man becomes poor by a wanton expenditure, when he earns money; he will earn money in the summer to a considerable amount, and spend it every Saturday night; this very individual in the winter has got nothing, and he comes to the overseer, and the overseer is obliged to relieve him, and he is actually taking the rates of men who have been earning less than he has. The law of England does not enable us to inquire how a man has become poor, but if he is poor he must be relieved. But in a vestry there are different people, and different ways of thinking; there are some who would oppose the thing, and those perhaps after a time would fall into it; but, speaking my own mind, I think it is the best thing which could be done; it is permanent relief; it is good to the landed interest, because it may prevent their property falling, which as the poor rates rise must decrease in value, because, if a landlord lets his estate to a farmer, he lets it for a given number of years; in the course of that time the poor rate may become double; at the expiration of the lease, says the tenant, "I shall not give you above so much rent in future." I was talking with a principal farmer in our neighbourhood yesterday, who told me that the poor rate upon his land was ten shillings an acre.

1624. Have you not a manufactory in your parish?—Yes, flax spinning.

1625. There is some idea, that if some of those families were to be removed where a manufactory exists, like your flax manufactory, by taking apprentices whenever there was a demand for hands, the gap would be immediately filled up; can you state what has been the practice at Feltham?—We have been very much increased in our poor's rates of late; the fact is, that we had four eighteen-penny rates last year; our disbursements have been years ago as high as they will be this year. With respect to the apprentices, as I said before, our burthen has been increased by that, no doubt, for, twelve or fourteen years ago, the occupiers of those mills were in the habit of taking a large number of apprentices from the different workhouses in London and in the country; they would send a cart, and bring ten or twelve at a time, at 5*l.* a head, and they would in forty days become settled in our parish; our overseers took those on the parish, and relieved them, which was wrong; being acquainted with apprenticing, I objected to that, I would not relieve any of them during the time they were apprentices; I threw a great many back upon their masters, and the consequence has been, that the present proprietors of the mills will not take any apprentices at all, they had been so loaded with them. There is a gentleman, that left the manufactory six or eight years ago, he had a number of apprentices; I have sent him a dozen or fourteen; I have told them to go to him for relief as their master, because their apprenticeships were not out. It

Mr.
James Taylor.

30 March,
1837.

is very well known by the Committee, that a man takes his apprentice in the same way as he does his wife, for better or worse, and he must maintain him for seven years; this being the case, has so far kept down our expenses; but then we feel the effect of that which has been done several years ago, and that makes our rates higher than in the surrounding parishes.

1626. The obliging the masters of manufactories to keep their apprentices during the seven years, has had the effect of restraining them in taking apprentices?—Yes, the manner in which they get their hands now is different; they hire children to attend the spinning machines, and it is done by children and overlookers; one man looks after seven or eight or ten children; they take them now by the week from the surrounding parishes, some from our parish and some from others, so that we have our share in the benefit of it; they pay them from half a crown a week to six shillings.

1627. So that if any accident should befall any of those children, or the works should stop, the children go back to their parishes?—If the trade is very dull and heavy, they pay off their hands, and send them back again; and those they have taken lately from the workhouses in London, they send back again; the consequence is, that the parish officers do not think it worth while to send them.

1628. The effect of that in the parish of Feltham has been to restrain masters from taking apprentices?—Yes; the proprietors tell me they have taken no apprentices, male or female, lately; they have had sixty apprentices at a time within these seven years.

1629. Do you think those degraded paupers, whom you call profligate, would be ready to go to Canada, and commence clearing land?—They are not so likely as those I should call the industrious poor, and I do not think they would be likely to succeed so well. I believe there are a number of industrious poor in our parish, and men who would put up with a great deal of privation to keep off the parish.

1630. Those who would be willing to go are not those who are now receiving parish relief?—I am not alluding to any who do not receive parish relief; some receive it by way of their rent being paid, some by way of clothing, some at particular times of the year, in the winter, and so on.

1631. Would the emigration of those respectable and industrious paupers relieve you from the necessity of supporting those of a different character?—I can hardly tell that; it would certainly make way for their having more employ.

1632. Would they take advantage of the means of employ?—They might, on some particular occasions; but it is rather doubtful what would be the effect of it upon them.

1633. In your parish you would not think of sending out any that you did not think the parish would gain from the sending?—No, certainly not.

1634. Would those by the sending of whom your parish would gain the most, be those who would be willing to go?—A great deal depends upon how you can state the case to them, for Englishmen and the generality of the lower orders are very much attached to their country; though under a certain degree of privation, they are so attached to the soil, and so tender of being sent out, they will say, We will not be transported. The idea of being transported to America has lost ground now, because the convicts are sent to different parts, otherwise the very name of it would frighten a great many; but I believe that when once the prejudice of the poor people and the interest of people in the parish is got over respecting this plan, it will be a very beneficial one, and one that will be followed up, and that there will be even a desire to go upon that plan; but it takes a length of time to get over the prejudices of the people.

1635. You stated, that there are a number of houses for which you pay at the rate of 2s. a week, besides your own; to what description of people do they belong?—A man that has built a number of little low huts like cabins, on speculation; they belong mostly to one individual, who has got perhaps seven or eight and twenty altogether.

1636. Do they pay parish rates?—O yes; we allow them to compound for so many being full at a time; the overseer goes about four times a year, and he hardly ever finds them occupied by the same persons.

1637. The rent at present derived from those cottages is a much greater object to the owner than any reduction in the poor rates?—Yes; those cottages are in the hands of one man; he built them on speculation; he joined bricklayer and carpenter and all, and built them.

Mr.
James Taylor,
22 March,
1827.

1638. If the persons who are now inhabiting those cottages were removed by this system of emigration, have you any means of preventing their being filled again?—No, not of preventing that, for there are many not occupied by the poor of our parish.

1639. Have you any persons whom you relieve, residing in other parishes?—O yes; we have no workhouse; we relieve families to the amount of sixteen or seventeen shillings a week.

1640. They are persons for whom you have no room at home?—No, our poor-houses are all full; they always fill, and we pay rent for ten more.

1641. Do you consider that those persons so relieved in other parishes are relieved by you at a cheaper rate than if you had them at home?—I cannot say; we have no workhouse in our parish.

1642. Do you conceive that persons whom you relieve in other parishes, you relieve at a cheaper rate than if they were in the houses in your own parish?—We relieve them on a small scale; we give them half-a-crown; there is here and there a very infirm person who has had three shillings, and some few three and sixpence.

1643. Are there any persons now living in a distant parish, to whom you pay a certain sum, to prevent their coming home, and throwing themselves upon you altogether?—Those are mostly widows and children; there is one very infirm man at Reading that we pay to.

1644. Are there any persons belonging to your parish of this description, persons living in a distant parish, who gain a certain quantity of employment there, and to whom you pay a certain sum of relief to prevent their coming home to you, and throwing themselves altogether upon you?—There is a man and his wife at Reading, to whom we allow 2s. a week, and he has got three children.

1645. Do you conceive that if that person knew there were houses in your parish vacant, he would be likely to come home to his own parish, and thereby become chargeable to you altogether?—No, he works in a silk manufactory at Reading, and he has a boy, who is capable of doing a little; he is very infirm; we went down once to see him; we made this allowance, because, from his ailing state of health and that of his wife, and one child they had got not being competent, we thought that they ought to receive an allowance.

1646. If he were to come home, and put himself into one of those cottages belonging to this proprietor in your parish, what should you then allow him?—If he was at home, we should find him some work; owing to the state of the man's health, we could not set him to wheel gravel; if we were to cease to allow him the two shillings a week, Reading would remove him immediately.

1647. If he were removed from Reading to your parish, what would he then cost?—I believe he has three shillings a week; we have no work he could do; if he was employed on the roads, the surveyor would allow him a shilling a day, and I should have to make up the amount; the surveyor would pay him six shillings a week, I should pay him three shillings, making nine shillings a week.

1648. When you say you pay those people at this rate, do you pay the rent besides?—Yes, for most of them, not all; there are about three or four and twenty families that we want rooms for, they are mostly the men who are out of work.

1649. The persons for whom you pay those rents, are in the receipt of nine shillings a week nine months in the year, and have their rents paid for them?—Yes.

1650. Is there any other mode of gaining a settlement except apprenticeship?—Yes, a yearly servitude; we get an increase in that kind of way; there are farmers who go to country fairs round about, sometimes as low down as Reading, and hire their servants from the country; owing to their getting a little more money near London, they get their servants rather cheaper: When they have served a year, they gain a settlement, then after they have been for a year or two, they want to go on their own hands; they do not get so high wages lower down, and that is an inducement to them to leave, and that brings on a good deal of hardship on the parish.

1651. It is for the interest of a farmer to go and get his labourers from a distance, in order to obtain them cheaper?—Yes, and they do that.

1652. Have you seen this year the way in which the poor of Merton are employed?—Yes, I had occasion to go to Merton, and I walked from Kingston to Merton; in going up a lane, called Combe-lane, I saw a quantity of people, eight

Mr.
James Taylor.

22 March,
1827.

or nine, wheeling gravel along the road, two or three in a company, with each of them a harrow: I expected I should see it shot down shortly, but I went on from Combe Wood Warren to Merton, that is three miles, and there I found them shooting the gravel down by the side of the road. I had to come back, and I thought I would inquire how they paid for labour, as we had men employed in wheeling gravel; I asked one of them, "You seem to be heavily laden, my man, (two bushels of gravel in the harrow is a heavy load,) how do you manage this?" "I have three-pence a bushel to wheel it three miles; I take two bushels at a time, that makes six-pence." Then they could go twice a-day, if they would let them; but the single men they would not permit to go twice a-day, they went twice one day, and once the other; the married men went twice. I thought it the tightest fit of labour I ever saw, to wheel two bushels of gravel that distance; our men do not wheel one.

Mr. James Harewood, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
James Harewood.

1653. WHERE do you reside?—At Headcorn, near Maidstone, in Kent.

1654. Have you any knowledge of paupers from that parish having been sent out to America?—Yes.

1655. Have you a statement of the number of persons who have been sent?—I have; I took it out of the parish book yesterday.

1656. It appears by this paper, that eighty persons were sent from your parish?—Yes.

1657. Did you give those persons money to take them to the ship?—We agreed on a sum which we supposed it would cost them, and that they would have a trifle of money in their pockets when they arrived in America.

1658. Do you find any disposition on the part of the people to emigrate?—Yes, we have several men who wish to go now.

1659. Have you had an opportunity of hearing from those people who have arrived?—Yes, they have all done well, none of them wish to come back.

1660. You applied those sums from the parish rates?—Yes; a part of the money we have borrowed; we owe now about a hundred and seventy pounds out of that sum; but we have called a vestry, and taken the general opinion of the parish; if there is only one objection we cannot do it, but we have never met with an objection; those persons who now wish to go, we have objections against, and therefore we cannot send them.

1661. What is the total number you have sent?—Eighty, I think.

1662. Have you found an advantage in the reduction of your rates?—Yes, it appears by that paper I have given in, but not so much as I expected it should.

1663. Were those persons all paupers chargeable upon the parish?—They were, all of them.

1664. What is the effect produced upon your parish rates by their removal?—In the year 1823, we raised 2,308*l.* 11*s.* 3*d.*; in the year following, 1824, we raised 2,025*l.*; in the year 1825, we raised 1,925*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.*; and the present year is 1,919*l.* 16*s.*

1665. Have you every year been incurring an expense in the conveyance of persons to Canada?—Yes, we owe now 170*l.* all the rest has been paid; we took down what those people had cost us for some time back, a year back, and we concluded we would borrow the money and pay off the sum which they had cost us, calculating that there was no reason to think but that they would cost us as much if we kept them at home.

1666. At what did you estimate the payments to those people?—Sometimes they cost a great deal of money, sometimes they cost us a little less; one of those persons, Edward Chambers, cost us sixteen shillings a week for some time before he went. The criterion to judge of the expense would be, to take the cases of Chambers and Morgan and the others, who had not any thing of their own; they were sent entirely at the parish expense; several others had friends who assisted them, and gave them part of the money.

1667. Though you have been incurring annually an expense for the conveying emigrants to Canada, your rates have notwithstanding been decreased?—They have been.

1668. What was the amount of expenditure on those individuals who were sent out wholly at the expense of the parish?—179*l.*

1669. What

Mr.
James Humeau.
30 March,
1827.

1669. What was the average expense per head, or per family?—All the expense was taken in one sum; they all went together; they went to Liverpool; we sent a waggon down with them.

1670. How many persons were sent out for that 179*l*?—Twenty-three.

1671. When were they sent out?—In March 1824.

1672. What proportion of men and women and children were there out of those twenty-three persons?—Six men, three women, and fourteen children.

1673. Those three and twenty persons were sent wholly at the expense of the parish, and for an outlay of money not amounting to 8*l* per head?—They were sent for this sum; I have not calculated the amount per head.

1674. Do you know to what part of America they went?—I believe they are all in the State of New York. One family, Chambers, had gone up to near Lake Erie; of the young men, one is in New York and another in a distant part of the country.

1675. Were they agricultural labourers?—They were all agricultural labourers.

1676. Did you put the money into their own hands?—No, our overseer went down to Liverpool, and paid the money into the hands of the captain after they had agreed for the passage; they had some money, to bear their expenses to Liverpool.

1677. Is the expense to Liverpool included in the sum of 179*l*?—Yes.

1678. Do you think that it has, or not, answered to your parish?—Our assessment has not been so low as I expected it would, in consequence; we have more men now than we can employ, and we can afford to pay our men better than if we had a greater number. I consider myself that upon the whole the parish is benefited, but not to the extent that I expected it would.

1679. The subsequent emigrations were at a less expense per head?—Yes, because they had some assistance from other persons.

1680. Do you think that the parish was so far benefited by the removal of those persons, that it would even have been benefited if the money required for their passage had been nearly doubled?—I think the parish would gain by it.

1681. You think it would have answered to the parish to lay out sixteen pounds a-head rather than keep them at home?—Yes, I think so, for now we can find more labour for the men who remain; and keeping them in idleness is the destruction of the men, it is the very worst thing for themselves and for the parish too.

1682. What is your population at this time?—1190.

1683. How many of those receive parish relief?—550.

1684. How many more have you than you can now find productive labour for?—Twenty-five.

1685. What number of emigrants do you think would effectually relieve you from your superabundant population?—I should think at present that probably if there were forty, men women and children, sent away, that would give us relief, and that we should be able to employ the rest. We have at this time thirty families that are seeking for employment in different parishes round about us, some of them up near London; they come to us occasionally for relief, but it is but small.

1686. Do you mean forty persons or forty families?—I calculate ten families, at four in a family; but there are a great many young ones growing up, that would not relieve us long.

1687. How could getting rid of forty relieve the parish?—There are thirty families in our parish who receive a very small relief; they are liable to come home; but the number I have stated here includes every one, if they do not receive above five shillings a-year.

1688. You think that you could employ all the rest in profitable labour, if you got rid of forty?—Yes, in the dead of winter; there always have been some who have been receiving something, but not to any great amount.

1689. Do you know what was the expense of the conveyance of those persons whom you sent to Liverpool?—I took them down myself, in my waggon; the parish paid me 30*l* for their conveyance.

1690. Can you state the expense per head for their conveyance to America?—I cannot, without reference to papers at home, but I will furnish that information.

1691. Was 30*l* the whole expense for their conveyance to Liverpool?—Yes.

1692. It appears from the paper before the Committee, that you have conveyed eighty; you have stated the expense of twenty-three; from whence did the others go?—They were sent from London.

Mr.
James Homewood,
20 March,
1847.

1693. What became of the houses in which those people lived?—Some of them are empty now.

1694. Are none of them pulled down?—No; those which are let, are let at only half the rent they used to get for them.

1695. Are they occupied by parishioners?—Yes; we do not let any other persons come, if we can help it.

1696. There will be no new settlements obtained in consequence of their leaving?—I hope not.

Mr. Samuel Maise, called in; and Examined.

Mr.
Samuel Maise.

1697. IN what part of the country do you reside?—At Hanworth, in the county of Middlesex.

1698. How far is that from London?—Twelve miles from Hyde Park Corner.

1699. Are you overseer of that parish?—I am.

1700. Are there a great number of unemployed poor in that parish?—Yes, there are.

1701. Supposing a man and woman and three children to be wholly out of employment the whole year, at what should you estimate the expense to the parish?—I should think from ten to twelve shillings a week.

1702. In point of fact those persons cost 25*l.* a year to the parish?—Yes, supposing them to be out of employ the whole year.

1703. Are you not of opinion that if a certain number of families were taken away who were unemployed the whole year, that would have a very material effect in relieving the poor's rates?—Yes, I think it would produce a great relief to the parish.

1704. Have you a great many who are at all times on the parish rates, except during the harvest months?—Yes, a great many who are employed on the roads, where they earn very little.

1705. You have stated, that a family consisting of a man, a woman and three children, would cost 25*l.* a year; suppose the man to be able-bodied, and the family healthy, do you think the parish would consent to mortgage their rates for ten years, from eight to ten pounds a year, provided an Act were passed relieving them from all further claims from those persons?—Speaking from myself, I should consent to it; but I cannot state the opinion of the parish.

1706. Have you any doubt that when the parish were informed that the saving would be 15*l.* a year, that would induce the generality of the parish to come into that proposition?—That would divide itself in this way; some of the occupiers of land, who have leases which will not exist more than five years, would oppose it; while those who have to stay in the parish for twenty years would approve of it.

1707. If a man has a lease for five years, he would find that instead of paying 25*l.* he would pay 10*l.*; would he not have an interest in that change?—Certainly.

1708. Are you of opinion that if that was adopted by the parish, effectual means could and would be taken to prevent the poor gaining fresh settlement in the parish?—Yes, I think there would.

1709. Do you think the future inhabitants of the cottages they might leave would gain a settlement?—No, I do not think that the parish would allow it, if they could help it.

1710. Do you ever pay the rent of cottages out of the poor's rate in this parish?—Partially we do, but not generally; we set our faces against it, but in case of necessity we are obliged to do it.

1711. You restrict that observation to cases where the pauper must have a house over his head, and you are obliged to pay the rent, for the purpose of finding him lodging?—Yes, we pay the rent of several cottages under those circumstances.

1712. Do you think that if the prospect of relief from that state of dependence, by being sent out to Canada, were held out to those persons, they would be ready to avail themselves of it?—I think, if they generally understood it, they would feel it a very desirable thing, for there are a great many of the parishioners who are able-bodied men, who are willing to get work, and cannot get work to do.

1713. And that class of persons, you think, would feel disposed to assent to the proposition?—I think so.

1714 Has

Mr.
Samuel Maine.
20 March,
1837.

1714. Has your pauper population increased lately?—Yes, we have had it increased very much, by their being sent home from other parishes.

1715. When a man becomes permanently on your parish, with his family, after he has been there a year or two, is there a probability of his again getting employment, and getting off the rates?—I have not found it so; according to the experience I have in the parish, there is not one in a hundred who gets off again.

1716. Their families increase?—Yes.

1717. And there is a prospect of their children remaining on the parish?—Yes; they get married, and the first time the wife is put to bed, they become burthensome to us.

1718. You think their state of distress does not prevent their increasing?—No.

1719. On the other hand, they are interested in having a family, because you allow them according to their families?—Yes; I allow some families 15s. a week, and they can do very little with that; they have their house-rent paid for them besides.

1720. Have you a select vestry in your parish?—A public vestry.

1721. What is the size of your parish?—The whole population is 600, and the parish contains about thirteen hundred acres of land.

1722. What is the size of your poor-house?—We have no poor-house; we have built five cottages lately.

1723. What do you think would be the probable expense of building a work-house in your parish, to contain all your pauper poor?—I should think it would take us 1500*l*.

1724. At what would you estimate the expense of each man, woman and child in the parish, when you got them there?—I think it would not be possible to support them so cheaply as we do at present.

1725. Have not all the farmers in your parish as many hands as they can employ?—Yes, a great many more than can be employed; there are a great many paupers that want employment, I should think eight months out of twelve.

1726. Do you think that of those people who are not employed, from not being able to find employment, if they were to be put into a poor-house, any valuable result would follow from that?—I think not.

1727. Have not you more able-bodied paupers in your parish than you can find employment for?—Certainly we have.

1728. (*To Mr. Taylor.*) Are there not many able-bodied paupers in the parish of Feltham, for whom you can find no employment?—Yes, ten months out of twelve.

1729. (*To Mr. Lacoste.*) Are there not many able-bodied paupers in the parish of Chertsey, for whom you can find no employment?—Yes, we have many more able-bodied labourers than we can find employment for.

1730. (*To Mr. Maine.*) Supposing a system were adopted, under which pauper families could emigrate, and that the parishes were willing to charge their rates for the purpose of emigration in the manner suggested; after such a plan had been fully explained to the poor, and when they understood all the advantages it offered to them, are you not of opinion that practically you would be able to keep at a less expense those able-bodied paupers who preferred staying in the parish upon their parochial rights, to taking advantage of the facilities held out to emigration?—Certainly.

1731. Do you not think that the effect of that would be to reduce the amount paid to those persons?—There is not the least doubt of it.

1732. But as you know that many of those men are not out of work in consequence of their own idleness, but in consequence of there being no work for them, you feel that it would be very harsh to reduce them to that degree of pressure to which you think you would feel yourself justified in resorting, if there were facilities afforded for emigration?—Yes, certainly.

Sabbati, 24^a die Martii, 1827.

[The Chairman presented to the Committee, in pursuance of their Order of the 27th February last, Return from the several Townships in the Parish of Wilslow, in the county and diocese of Chester; and the same was read, and is as followeth:]

RETURN in answer to the Order of the Select Committee of EMIGRATION, addressed to the Overseers of the several Townships in the Parish of Wilslow, County and Diocese of Chester.

QUESTIONS.	Bollin Pcc.	Powsall Pcc.	Charley.	Falshaw.	TOTAL.
Query 1st. The number of houses inhabited by persons who have received relief of any description from the poor rates - - -	72	22	7	6	118
Query 2d. The number of such houses, of which either the whole or part of the rent has been paid, directly or indirectly, out of the poor rates - - -	37	11	4	3	55
Query 3d. The number of houses inhabited by paupers, which are the property of individuals belonging to the select vestry - - -	7	40	1	- - -	48
The above is a true Return, to the best of our knowledge and belief - - -	Charles Fletcher, George Shatwell, Overscers.	Isaac Goodier, for Roger Bondary, Overscers.	George Fletcher, Ben ^y Whittigg, Overscers.	Mary Ann Burgess, Overscers.	

THIS Return is limited to such houses as are situated within the parish, and does not include the rents paid on account of paupers who reside in other districts.

Wilslow,
March 20, 1827.

J. M. Turner,
(Rector of Wilslow.)

Alexander Campbell, Esq. called in; and Examined.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

1733. YOU are Sheriff Substitute for Renfrewshire, and resident in Paisley?—Yes; I have been so these 24 years.

1734. Have you had an opportunity of reading the evidence given before this Committee on the subject of Scotland?—I have read the evidence only of a few witnesses. I have read that of Mr. Maxwell, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Home Drummond, Mr. Kennedy, of John Tait and James Wilson, two weavers delegated by the Emigration Societies in Paisley, and of Mr. Northhouse.

1735. Do you concur in the details of the present state of the population, as stated by those witnesses?—I concur, generally, as to the state of distress; but there are things stated of which I am ignorant, and some few things as to which I should perhaps not give the same answers.

1736. Will you refer to any opinions from which you would be obliged, in some degree, to dissent?—I really am not able at this moment to do so from recollection, having had but a very hasty perusal of the evidence referred to.

1737. Do you concur as to the extent of distress which has been described by the witnesses?—I do; the distress was very general and very great.

1738. Are you aware of the circumstance of the probable ejection of a great number of weavers families, in the course of the month of May, from their present habitations?—I think that is extremely probable; I know very well that the rents of houses possessed by the weaving classes of Paisley have been extremely

extremely ill paid for the last year; worse, perhaps, than they ever were before; the owners of houses, of course, are very much dissatisfied, being in many instances themselves dependent upon the rents; and I believe, now that a recent and very considerable increase of employment has taken place, for what is called the spring trade, and that wages have advanced a little, the owners will be disposed to use their utmost exertions to obtain payment of their rents; and in Scotland the Committee are aware that houses are almost universally taken by the year, from May to May.

1739. Are you of opinion that the removal of a certain number of families, according to the principles explained by the questions put to previous witnesses, would have the effect of mitigating the distress, by improving the condition of those who remain?—I certainly am; at least for a time.

1740. With reference to the principle, that the removal of the excess of redundant pauper population will materially improve the condition of those who remain, are you enabled to furnish the Committee with any conjectural estimate as to the number of persons (measuring them in the proportion of families of five, consisting of a man, a woman, and three children) who might be removed from the neighbourhood of Glasgow and Paisley, in the course of the present year, and the comfort of those who remain be materially improved by such removal?—I have not turned my attention to an estimate of that description, but I should certainly think that the removal of those who are now applying to this Committee, and who are extremely anxious to remove, would have a decided, though probably a temporary effect in improving the condition of those who remain.

1741. Are you enabled to state to the Committee the precise number of those whom you consider as direct petitioners before this Committee for emigration?—According to my information, which is perhaps not so exact as that which has been given by Mr. Northhouse in particular, and which is derived from conversations at different times with some of the delegates from the emigration societies, I make the number of heads of families belonging to Renfrewshire Emigration Societies to be 920, independent of a society called the Irish Protestant and the Kilbarnon Society, and perhaps some other, and I should estimate the whole at more than a thousand families.

1742. Probably the calculation may be sufficiently accurate in estimating these at the proportion of 5,000 persons, including men, women and children?—Yes. I think there is one Irish society not included in the 920 families which I have mentioned; that society consists of 100 families; the majority of the men not being weavers, they endeavoured to join themselves, as they say, to other emigration societies of Scotsmen about Paisley, but having been rejected by all, they called on me to express their apprehension lest their claims should, on that account, be overlooked by this Committee. It is to be understood that I speak merely of Renfrewshire.

1743. You give no evidence respecting the state of Lanarkshire?—No.

1744. Are the Committee to understand that the wages of the hand-loom weavers are at the present moment rather on the increase?—I am afraid not at present; I have endeavoured to obtain some information upon that point, from weavers and master manufacturers, but I find great doubt entertained on all hands, whether trade is likely to become brisker as the season advances. The Committee are perhaps not aware that master manufacturers feel themselves entitled, as a matter of course, to embark a considerable extent of property in manufacturing silk and cotton goods, for the spring trade as it is called, the sales at that period of the year being the steadiest and most extensive; at least I understand it to be so for Paisley manufactures. As the spring came on, a demand for weavers came with it, and, as I have said, some advance in wages took place; but I am told that many master manufacturers doubt whether already they have not a sufficient stock of goods on hand, and that all of them are in great uncertainty whether the demand be likely to continue. The immediate prospect of demand for out-of-door labour is even less; there seems at present a total stop to the building of houses, which used to give employment to many labourers.

1745. Are you of opinion that if in the course of the present year 2,000 persons out of the 5,000 supposed to be included in the petition from Renfrewshire, were to be removed to Nova Scotia as emigrants, that in addition to the absolute effect produced by the abstraction of those persons, the hope of future removal, if necessary, would not operate to tranquillize their minds, and be of

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1857.

very general service to the district, independently of the mere removal of pecuniary pressure by such abstraction?—I think it might.

1746. You are aware that it would not be in contemplation to remove any of the petitioners who are not within certain ages, and from their general state of health and habits fairly competent to become agricultural settlers?—I think that such a principle would be very expedient.

1747. Consequently, the impression of that principle will be to diminish, to a considerable extent, the number of those who are the subjects of removal?—Perhaps it might diminish the number.

1748. Probably a thousand out of the five thousand might be taken off, by their not being of the class of persons who could be removed under such a regulation?—I dare say there might be a reduction, but to what extent I have not had access to know.

1749. You are aware that some of those persons have appeared before the Committee, and have pledged themselves, in consequence of the conviction they have received from their friends in Canada (this emigration being intended to Nova Scotia, but the principle must be the same) that they should be perfectly able to repay the expense incurred in their removal, and that if necessary, they would, jointly and severally, bind themselves to effect such payment at the end of seven years, when it is proposed that it shall commence, and in the meantime pay interest at five per cent on the money expended in their removal, a lien remaining upon their lands as an additional security; are you of opinion that those parties will continue fixed in their resolution to perform this part of their contract?—As matter of opinion, it is mine, that these people, such has been the extent of their depression at home, will most gratefully accede to a proposal in these terms, and I am persuaded that their intentions to fulfil whatever pledge they give, are at present honest and sincere. But I must add, that though I perceive that their immediate conveyance to Nova Scotia, and not to Upper Canada, may be a matter of expediency, it is new to me; and I have some doubt whether the proposition of making Nova Scotia their destination will not be felt as a great disappointment by the expecting emigrants. They have got ideas with respect to the climate and the soil, and the previous settlers in Upper Canada, (some of whom are their correspondents and acquaintances) that I fear are different from the notions they entertain of Nova Scotia; about which, at all events, I question if they possess very perfect information. I fear they would be disappointed if they understood that it was intended to locate them in Nova Scotia; but at the same time, such has been their expectations and anxiety for a considerable time about being furnished with the means of emigration, that I conceive the offer of being sent out to Nova Scotia, though less acceptable, will be received as a boon.

1750. Are you of opinion that the advantage of securing this emigration would be strongly felt in the county of Renfrew, that if facilities are given to effect it, there would be any disposition on the part of the proprietors of lands in that county to raise money on the security of a county rate, or by other means, to assist for the purposes of this emigration in the proportion of one-third, it being estimated that 1,000 persons could be removed for the expense of 60*l.* each family, making 12,000*l.* for the whole?—I have had no opportunity of putting a question of that sort to any considerable number of the landholders, and I have therefore no direct authority for what I am about to say; but I do feel very confident that it would be extremely difficult to raise any sum in the way proposed, that would be worth acceptance in aid of emigration. The county gentlemen of Renfrewshire have already incurred considerable, and some of them very great expense in alleviating the late severe and protracted distress; and now that it has abated, (though leaving its victims exhausted,) I am of opinion that they will not be disposed to contribute further at present; and this the more especially as there exists some difference of opinion in the county of Renfrew, respecting the advantages of emigration. It is not for the interest of master manufacturers in the West of Scotland, that the labour market should be drained of a large portion of ingenious tradesmen; and it may be easily conceived that apprehensions will arise, that a number of these men, by passing over to the United States, may injure us in a national point of view; although I, for one, do not believe that the proposed emigrants have any such intentions at present. The conduct of the landholders must of necessity be very much regulated in all such matters by the peculiarity of the Scottish poor laws; and there is no power, at present recognised in

in the law of Scotland, by which the county can be assessed for such a purpose. As to voluntary contributions, many strong reasons will occur against it.

1751. The question was put under the idea that a legislative power may be given to counties to raise an annual rate, by which money could be borrowed for this purpose?—I feel some doubt about that also; I do believe that many of the landholders of Renfrewshire would be disposed to regard the proposed mode of administering relief rather as a national than a county question, and would deem it extremely hard, that, because they happened to be landholders of a particular county more deeply affected than most others by the late general depression of trade, they should be made responsible in a mode so new, especially after the contributions they have already made to avert absolute starvation and disease.

1752. Can you give the Committee any sort of approximation to the amount of money which in the course of the last year, 1826, has been contributed by Renfrewshire towards the expense of the pauper weavers, under motives of charity?—Yes; I find by an account which I have had taken from the books of the County Relief Committee, (of which I am a member,) that the amount received within the last twelve months, from the King, from the London Committee, from the Edinburgh Committee, from the county of Haddington, from the Newcastle Committee, and from the Glasgow Committee, amounts to within a fraction of 14,000*l.*; and I find that the amount of local contributions of the county of Renfrew, raised by voluntary subscription and by various expedients, amounts in round numbers to about 8,000*l.*, making a total of about 22,000*l.*

1753. Independently of coals?—Yes; and independent of donations for a soup kitchen in Paisley, and in clothing. But I believe the direct contributions got from the inhabitants of the county of Renfrew cannot be stated much higher than 5,000*l.* These contributions, however, are all exclusive of private charity given to a great extent by individuals.

1754. Then, in point of fact, unless causes which cannot be at present anticipated, remove this distress, the county of Renfrew, if it continues to exercise the same degree of charity it has done, will be called upon to pay 5,000*l.* per annum; and if the other sources of relief which you have mentioned should fail, they would be placed under the alternative of witnessing the absolute destruction by famine of this poorer population, unless their contributions shall be increased largely beyond the 5,000*l.*?—I should think that an effect which will not be anticipated at present. I have already stated that the distress has in the mean time very greatly abated, by the increase of employment in the course of the Spring trade; and I have to add the following particulars:—

The greatest number on the county committee's regular list of persons to whom allowances were given in any single week, from the commencement of our distresses in Spring 1826, down to the 22d February last, was in the week ending 21st December, being 2,725 families; the average number was 2,030.

Subsequent to the 21st December, the average number stood thus:—

1826: December 28	- - - -	2,675 families.
1827: January 4	- - - -	2,622 —
— 11	- - - -	2,473 —
— 18	- - - -	2,109 —
— 25	- - - -	1,726 —
February 1	- - - -	1,473 —
— 8	- - - -	1,361 —
— 15	- - - -	1,245 —
— 22	- - - -	1,088 —
March 1	- - - -	1,044 —
— 8	- - - -	975 —
— 15	- - - -	936 —

Showing a decrease, in twelve weeks, of 1,739 families. In those 936 families there are, as I understand, no weavers who are proper objects of emigration; I do not believe that any of the petitioners are of their number. They consist generally of aged or indifferent workers, whose earnings, if employed, would be inadequate for their support, and who probably have not the necessary implements for weaving;

A. Campbell,
Esq.24 March,
1857.

and of females, who used to earn a subsistence by kinds of work for which a demand has not revived. It is inherent in the nature of trade and manufactures, that at certain periods there will occur seasons of stagnation and distress, whereby a great many operatives are thrown out of employment; but such seasons of adversity do not necessarily, in Scotland, entail upon the landholders any very severe burden, unless the distress be of long continuance, and the numbers thrown out so extremely large as to threaten epidemic disease or disturbance, in which case all minor considerations will give way. I do not believe it is anticipated at present that such an occurrence will soon take place again, although there are causes operating which may depress the wages of manufacturing labour very low; and if any steps could be taken to prevent the influx of poor Irish, it is believed by many that there would be no permanent redundancy in the labour market of Scotland.

1755. Supposing that measures were to be taken generally, which would practically produce a less influx of native Irish into Scotland, such measures being concurrent with any change to be sustained by the country eventually for the purposes of emigration, are you not of opinion that the knowledge of that fact would tend to reconcile the inhabitants of that country to any permanent change imposed upon them, for the purpose of getting rid of that population?—I should think it very difficult to reconcile the county of Renfrew, or any county in Scotland, to a permanent change of that kind; as a general measure, the county of Renfrew might possibly concur, but only concur with other counties in Scotland, in paying a sum for the being insured against a recurrence of similar distresses as connected with a redundant manufacturing population, and with a corresponding burden upon the poor funds. But the stronger probability is, that the landholders would generally prefer to take the risk of a distant contingency, than to incur a certain pecuniary obligation of the description referred to.

1756. You have stated, that for the last year the expense for charity in the county of Renfrew far exceeded the sum of 5,000*l.*; and from all the evidence this Committee has received, an uniform opinion has been stated, that in consequence of the power-loom having superseded the hand loom, there is no chance whatever of a demand for the labour of the weavers in the neighbourhood of Glasgow and Paisley increasing, so as to improve their present condition?—In the first place I would remark, that I do not consider power-looms to have been in any very considerable degree the cause of our late distresses; I believe that the previous speculative excess of manufactures in general, and the consequent glut in all the markets, have been the principal causes. In the county of Renfrew in particular, the prevailing manufactures are figured goods of silk and of cotton, upon which a deal of expensive work is bestowed, and which the power-looms cannot produce. I am quite aware that power-looms have a very considerable and an increasing effect in superseding hand looms in every manufacturing district, though perhaps less in Renfrewshire than elsewhere. And prospectively speaking, I believe that the operation of power-looms, joined to the increased production of foreign manufactures, may have a powerful and permanent influence in diminishing the demand for hand-loom weavers.

1757. If you do not attribute much of the distress to the power-looms, what do you consider to be the reason why the weavers are in so much a worse situation than the spinners?—It may be a little difficult for one who is not a manufacturer to give a satisfactory answer, but I believe a cotton spinner could easily do so. The cotton spinning is a peculiar trade, and the wages in it have been always high; and one reason, at least, why they are high is, that the employment is considered unhealthy, and the work hours are long. Foreigners, to enable themselves to weave cotton fabrics, were obliged to purchase the yarn from our spinners, and hence the latter might be in full employment, while the weavers were not. But notwithstanding these reasons, and the facilities they have for combination and mutual support, I have been often surprised how the wages of cotton spinners could have been so very high, when other operatives, who deserved at least as well, were starving; but such has been the fact.

1758. In point of fact, though you do not concur as to the precise effect produced by the power-looms, stated by other witnesses, you do concur in thinking that there are causes not less operative, which make it improbable that the present redundant manufacturing population can fairly be absorbed by the demands of the capitalists, so as to place them in a materially improved condition?—I agree in

in that proposition, keeping in view, however, that at present the employment is pretty general, though the wages are low.

1759. Are you of opinion that, allowing ample time for the subject to be understood, if 5,000 persons were removed from the county of Renfrew, and, if measures were taken of a similar nature, from other parts of the United Kingdom where population may be in excess, there would be any indisposition on the part of the proprietors in the county of Renfrew to establish a county rate to the extent of a thousand pounds per annum for 60 years, for the purpose of getting rid of those 5,000 persons; under which county rate it is to be presumed, and must be considered as part of the question, that they will be relieved from the claim upon their charity which you have described to have actually taken place to the extent of 5,000*l.* in the course of the last year?—The claim alluded to, being a claim upon charity, will be considered as having been discharged for a time; and if the proposed county rate is supposed to apply solely to the landholder, I do certainly feel no hesitation in assuring the Committee, that the very strongest objections will be felt to any such assessment.

1760. Would any rate that would bear upon property other than land, combined with the rate upon the land producing the same amount, be more likely to be acceded to?—It would certainly be more acceptable to the landholders, if there should be a county rate, that part of it should apply to those who are considered by them as the means of bringing into the county, when trade is flourishing, a large number of people, who, when a reverse comes, are thrown upon the poor's rates, or become supplicants for spontaneous relief. The landholders will naturally contend, that a full proportion should be borne by those who receive most advantage from the surplus labourers.

1761. Supposing that the manufacturing capitalists, and the owners of houses, were to refuse to consent to any such arrangement for such an object, you are of opinion that under all the given circumstances of society in the county of Renfrew the landholders would think that their own interests in a pecuniary point of view would be more consulted by the presence and continuance of this redundant population, than by getting rid of it for the charge of a thousand pounds per annum for 60 years as proposed; always presupposing that they are satisfied that that charge would effectually rid them of that population for the future?—I certainly do think that their objection would remain unimpaired, unless it were at such a time as we have just witnessed. The number of Irish amongst us, who may be regarded as constituting the mass of our surplus workers, would not by the agriculturists be reckoned as a very great evil; for it is a fact, that if an extensive drain, or canal, or road, or any other thing, were to make, that could be done by piece-work (for the ordinary farm labour of the county is performed by Scots servants engaged by the half year,) I should not feel in the least surprised to find, that of a hundred men employed at it, ninety were Irish; and indeed the Irish are considered to work at least as well, and certainly work a great deal cheaper than Scotsmen; they can live cheaper, and several things which a Scotchman or an Englishman feels to be indispensable to his comfort, an Irishman can do very well without. As for the manufacturing interest, of course the cheaper the market for labour, the better.

1762. Your answer is confined, is it not, to the feelings of the landholders; what is the feeling of the natives of that part of Scotland with which you are connected, with respect to the Irish?—I have no doubt there is a considerable degree of jealousy entertained, because they find their wages lowered by the influx of strangers; they find themselves driven out of a considerable range of employment.

1763. Do you consider that to be an unreasonable jealousy on the part of the labourers?—I do not think it is unreasonable.

1764. If it be reasonable, can it be consistent with the interest of the landholders, that the native population should be driven out of the country, and that all the other evils obvious from such a state of things should fall upon them?—I think that the landholders have reason upon the whole to regret that the influx of strangers is quite so great. In ordinary times it is all well, but when such a stagnation of manufacturing employment takes place as took place last year, the enormous number who may be thrown on parish support would bear very hard upon the landholders, when it is considered that it has lately been declared by the supreme court of Scotland as the law of the land, that an Irishman has all the privileges of a native in acquiring a legal parish settlement, entitling him to claim

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1847.

as matter of right to be maintained out of the poor's funds, by three years industrial residence.

1765. The Committee are, then, to understand you to say, that notwithstanding the claims which you state an Irish pauper labourer has upon parochial assistance as well as the Scotch native labourers, notwithstanding the fact that the proprietors of the county of Renfrew have contributed in the course of the last year 5,000*l.* for the purposes of charity, and notwithstanding that relief has been poured into the county of Renfrew by charitable subscriptions to a very great extent from other quarters, yet the landed interest on the one hand and the manufacturing interest on the other of that country, consider the advantage to be derived from cheaper labour so great, that they would rather be saddled with this excess of population than undergo an expense, admitted to be small compared with the charity alone, to get rid of the permanent effect of it!—I do not attribute to these parties that precise reasoning which the question includes. I am not sure if the remedy would be deemed permanently efficient, and probably the recurrence of the disasters recently experienced may not be experienced in any such terrific extent; but I think that on general grounds the Scottish landowners would be disposed to object to any thing that bears the appearance of a permanent poor's rate for able-bodied men, under any circumstances.

1766. When the Committee speak of a permanent rate of a thousand pounds a year for 60 years, they are speaking of a sum of 20,000*l.* at the present moment, under the idea that it would be more convenient to the county to produce in that way a definite object, than to saddle themselves with such an expense at once or at a short period; but all these questions are utterly irrelevant if it were to be understood that the county of Renfrew was unprepared to saddle itself with an annual expense of a thousand pounds, but that it would be prepared to raise 20,000*l.* at the present moment!—If it be assumed that there is again to recur a necessary expenditure (and by the county) of 20,000*l.* in one year, then certainly the landholders might consider it as not an unfit commutation to submit to a corresponding annual assessment; but I humbly apprehend that is not the light in which the landholders would be disposed to view the question. If we had not got the chief part of our large expenditure from national contribution through the medium of the London Committee, God knows what would have become of us. I conceive if such distress should ever occur again, that the landholders of Renfrew might consider it not as a local but as a national matter requiring the attention of government. Taking into view the demands of private charity which have entered into no account, the landholders of Renfrewshire would certainly have deemed it an intolerable burden to be bound to raise for the support of the indigent any thing like 20,000*l.* even aided by the contributions of the master manufacturers and other inhabitants. It must be taken into view, that while the operatives have been so severely depressed by low wages and want of demand for work, the master manufacturers themselves have not escaped. I have been credibly informed of one case of bankruptcy in Renfrewshire, in which the bankrupt's estate was found to have claims against between fifty and sixty other recently bankrupt estates; a sufficient proof of the distress that has affected the manufacturing interest in that part of the country.

1767. You have observed, that the gentlemen of the county of Renfrew would consider this as a national object rather than a local one, but the gentlemen of the county of Renfrew, under the assumed circumstances, would be called upon to furnish only one-third of the expense necessary to accomplish this object; 60,000*l.* would accomplish the emigration of 5,000 persons; therefore the proposition is, that if the county of Renfrew either advanced 20,000*l.* at once, or, preferring to spread the expense over a greater number of years, on the principle that posterity should share the burthen which should produce an advantage to them, would raise the 20,000*l.* on a long annuity of sixty years; in point of fact the case would stand thus, that for the purpose of removing 5,000 persons, under the removal of which, by the terms of the proposition, the county is to be released from all claim upon its charity, and all redundancy of population, the State would furnish the means of adding 40,000*l.* to the 20,000*l.* so proposed to be raised from the county!—It may seem a reproach upon the county of Renfrew for me to say, but I do really feel it necessary to say, in answer to the question, that I do not believe the county of Renfrew would willingly submit to any county rate of that description, that they could possibly resist. Setting aside all consideration respecting the source of the evil, and the permanency of the cure, the
Committee

Committee will remember that, in common with other Scottish counties, we are very little acquainted with such poor rates as prevail in England; and with regard to the county of Renfrew, though very considerable as a commercial and manufacturing county, it is but of small extent. The rent-roll of the landholders is by no means in proportion to its commercial or manufacturing importance. A county rate of 1,000*l.* a year is greater than the whole land tax that the county of Renfrew pays.

1763. Are the Committee to understand that the same observation would apply, if the expense was 500*l.* a year instead of a thousand?—I really believe so, as the objection would be founded upon principle as well as upon mere pecuniary amount.

1769. If the rate were fixed on real property only, the landholder would object; if the rate were charged on real and personal property, the landholders and the capitalists would join in the objection?—Yes.

1770. You are not enabled to hold out to the Committee any hope that the county of Renfrew, from a sense of its own interest, would concur in any contribution to the promotion of this object?—I am not; at least to any amount which the Committee would think at all material for the object in view.

1771. Do you concur in this observation, it is stated in a letter before the Committee, "Without some change or modification of the law of parish residence, I do not see that any effectual encouragement can be given to emigration: In the spring of 1820, we sent out a number of well-doing people to Canada, but their houses were filled with Irish, who, as two or three families are satisfied to accommodate themselves with a house which only held a single family before of the old population, and as the Irish women are possessed of greater fecundity than the Scotch, producing generally about one-fourth more children than the latter, that is, their families counting six heads in place of five, we are infinitely worse off than ever: the Scotch operatives and labourers are taking the inroads made upon them by those people much to heart, and the Emigrant Societies look to the Irish as the cause of their not getting away to America, by their preventing the gentry from helping to pay for the expense of the emigrants, under the impression that the Irish will fill up the places of those whom they would otherwise assist to go to the British colonies;" do you concur in that reasoning?—I concur generally in that reasoning. It most immediately strikes any man, upon whose property such a tax is proposed to be laid, to ask of what avail is that tax to be; is the recurrence of the emigration from Ireland, or other causes of distress, to be prevented. Unless some effectual preventative be given, there must be the greatest possible reluctance upon the part of the landholders of Scotland to incur their estates with an annual or other payment for the purpose of emigration.

1772. Do you believe that a body of Scotch gentlemen, whether landholders or manufacturers, would consent to charge themselves with a fixed certain burthen, upon the speculative hope that the cause of the present charge will not recur?—I do not.

1773. Are you aware that in the evidence received by this Committee from English parishes, an entirely contrary opinion has been given; that the English parishes, without a single exception (the proprietors in which, or the overseers of which, have been examined before the Committee) have expressed a readiness not only to charge their parishes to the extent of 20*l.* but of 60*l.* for every poor family emigrated?—I have been informed of that, and I think that they are making a reasonable bargain; but I think the situation of Scotland is very different, and that difference cannot be explained without adverting to the state of the poor laws.

1774. You stated in the early part of your evidence, that it would be a great benefit if those 5,000 persons could be removed; supposing that removal to take place, and assuming that the county of Renfrew had agreed to incur the proposed burthen, could that remedy prove effectual, unless the means were presented of preventing the chaos so occasioned from being filled up?—I think not, beyond a very limited period. The evil of an excessive influx of indigent Irish might be palliated by certain regulations, which it would not be very difficult to make; but I apprehend that the radical cure must be applied to the place where the evil originates; I apprehend that as long as Ireland remains in its present state, so long there will be a great influx.

1775. According to the present law of Scotland, is there any means of preventing the influx and the settlement of Irish poor, wherever there is a temptation for them to come?—Certainly none.

J. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1877.

1776. Is there not all the difference between England and Scotland in that respect, that there can be between a country overburthened with a system of poor laws, and a country in which that system has a very mitigated and partial operation?—Certainly there is an immense difference between the state of the two countries in that respect.

1777. And that which might reasonably be considered by the one country as a great relief, might be considered by the other as a precedent for the imposition of new and grievous burthens?—Certainly it might prove a great relief to England, but a very dangerous precedent in Scotland, at least it would be universally so esteemed.

1778. Can you state shortly to the Committee what the Scotch law of settlement is, and how it applies in the case of the Irish?—The Scotch law of settlement is extremely simple; by that law any man who has his residence for three years in any Scottish parish, will thereby acquire a legal settlement, unless he or some of his family have had recourse to begging for their support, or have been wholly or partially supported by charity during the course of those three years.

1779. If, then, a labourer from Ireland, or any other part of the King's dominions, and not only so, but from any foreign country, were to come and establish himself in a parish in Scotland, and live there for three years without being known to be a beggar, and without receiving any relief from the church money, or any other of the usual sources, he would be entitled to come upon that parish just as much as a native of that parish or of any part of Scotland?—According to a late decision of the supreme civil court of Scotland, that is declared to be the law; the point was tried in a case decided in 1824, at the suit of one Higgins, an Irishman, against the barony parish of Glasgow. The case, as stated in the printed reports of the decisions of the Court of Session, is this: The barony parish of Glasgow is one of the most populous in Scotland, and one of those in which an assessment for the poor has long prevailed. The managers resolved to admit no Irishmen upon the poor's roll, and that resolution was made the subject of complaint to the Court of Session in the name of Higgins, who had resided there for a good many years. The judgment of the court was to this effect; first, that the Court of Session have a controlling power in such cases; and in the second place, that the plaintiff in that case, from having had an industrial residence for more than three years in the parish, had acquired a legal settlement against the poor's rates, just as if he had been a native Scotchman. And indeed the principle of the judgment was expressly held to apply to foreigners in general.

1780. Was that case appealed to the House of Lords?—It was not.

1781. And it stands now as the declared law of Scotland?—It does.

1782. What means are afforded by the law of Scotland of transference, or, as it is called, of transportation of poor from one parish to another within Scotland, from a parish where they may have acquired a settlement, to the parish of their birth?—There is only one regulation in Scotland respecting removals, and it applies only to vagrants; it has no application to the ordinary poor, and indeed no practical operation at all. No person can, without his own consent, be removed from one parish to another in Scotland, unless he be a vagrant beggar.

1783. Supposing a person, a native of Scotland, residing in a parish in which he was a stranger, to be in the habit of receiving charity there from the parish, although not in the shape of assessment money, is it in the power of the parish to remove him to his own parish?—It is not in the power of the parish to do so, legally.

1784. Are there any means, however over-burthened the parish may be with Irish paupers, of removing them to Ireland?—No legal compulsory means; and in our very limited law of removal (which is utterly useless in practice) the idea of removal presupposes some other place bound to receive and support the person removed; removal to Ireland, therefore, ought to imply that there are poor funds in that country, or at least some means by which those removed can be provided for, and prevented from returning.

1785. A magistrate cannot order them out of the parish?—He cannot.

1786. It has been stated in the evidence of Mr. Campbell, the Member for Renfrew, that during the last year a number of Irish were sent from that part of the country with merely a loaf, and a few shillings in their pockets; by what authority were those persons removed?—That was done, not by legal, but by moral compulsion, if it was by compulsion at all. The Irish are probably either ignorant of their legal claims, or distrustful of having these acknowledged; and many

many have no legal claim, because they have gained no legal settlement. They were very glad to have the means of removal from a country where they could get no employment.

1787. As long as the law and circumstances of Scotland remain what they are with respect to the impossibility of preventing the influx and settlement of the numerous bands of Irish that come there, do you conceive that any emigration, however desirable on other accounts, and however desirable as a means of temporary relief, would afford any permanent relief to that country?—I do not believe that it would afford any permanent relief. A temporary relief I certainly think it would afford, for it is not in one month, nor perhaps in one year, that the vacuum could be filled up by persons able to do the work of those who had gone away; but I have not the least doubt, that the moment the labour market is drained to a certain extent, and the wages of those remaining, raised, every weaver, instead of endeavouring to send his sons and daughters to some other employment, will avail himself of their labour in his own trade; and as the business of a common weaver is not very difficult to learn, there arises in the course of two years a new generation of weavers; and from the same cause, those Irish who happen to be weavers of cotton or linen goods in Ireland, and who may hope for better wages in Scotland, would have the strongest temptation to come over. I understand that a linen weaver would not find any great difficulty to overcome in learning to weave cotton goods.

1788. Do you conceive it would be in the power of the landed proprietors to check the coming in of the Irish labourers, by refusing to allow them to have residences and cottages, were they so minded?—That is a subject which I feel to be one of extreme difficulty. There are certainly, however, some expedients which may be adopted without difficulty or without any violation of any established or fair principle. Let it be enacted that a longer period of years is requisite for an Irishman or a foreigner to acquire a legal settlement than for a native; and perhaps in addition to the extension of the period, there might be a qualification added, that the residence should have been in the capacity of *householders*; because when families of poor Irish come over, it is a long time before they get a house; they crowd great numbers together into lodgings, usually paying the rent by the week or fortnight; to Scotsmen, whether landowners or not, (for we all pay poor rates in assessed parishes) it will appear very hard that being a lodger in such circumstances, in a state bordering on beggary, should suffice to confer a full legal settlement.

1789. How do those poor Irish who come over, contrive to nourish themselves at first?—They have generally some friends or relations, who perhaps invite them to come over.

1790. What food do they eat chiefly?—Potatoes, of course, and other cheap food; it is surprising how little they can do with. I am quite certain, from what I have seen with my own eyes, that some of them can do without any thing which deserves the name of furniture or bed-clothes, and I suppose the cheapest food will suffice them.

1791. When they are in full employment, do they live more like the people of the country, or do they still persevere in the same way?—They gradually assimilate to the people of the country, and they cause the people of the country in some degree to assimilate to them. They have no notion of that degree of expense which is essential to a Scotchman's comfort. A Scotchman must be in a very degraded state who should not have decent clothes to appear at church on Sunday, or give his children education; but these things don't give much concern to the Irishman, at least for a considerable time.

1792. Under the relative circumstances of the two countries, what term of years do you think it reasonable to require for an Irishman to acquire a settlement in Scotland?—At a minimum, I should say seven years; and indeed that is the term of residence specified in some of our Scottish statutes on the subject of the poor.

1793. You think that that provision, coupled with the provision that he should be a householder, would afford a material relief?—I think it would operate as a check, and more especially if some precautionary measure could be devised to prevent suspicious persons from gaining a settlement by residence, such as warning them to remove.

1794. What is the law of Scotland with respect to affording parochial relief in circumstances where work cannot be found, setting aside the cases of the aged, the

*A. Campbell,
Esq.*

94 March,
1847.

diseased, the blind, and so on, the question being confined to such cases as arise when work cannot be obtained?—I presume the Committee is aware how extremely similar the early Scottish enactments upon that subject are to the early English, and how very different their practical operation has been. Our leading statute was passed in the year 1579, and it confined parish relief to persons described as “aged, poor, impotent and decayed persons, who of necessity must live by alms;” and in the practice of Scotland, parish relief has hitherto been confined to that description of persons, and I believe it was never heard of until the beginning of the present century, when an universal scarcity of provisions prevailed in Scotland, when in one of the southern parishes an assessment was imposed partly at least for the relief of people whose wages were insufficient to procure the necessary supply of food, and who had no other claim; I allude to the case of Pollock against Darling. In that case, an individual, who was assessed, resisted payment upon the ground that there was no law existing in Scotland by which any such assessment could be imposed for the support of able-bodied men; the supreme court decided that the assessment was valid. But I believe this has never been regarded as a sufficient precedent to settle the general question; and among other reasons for this opinion, the claim was not at the instance of a person asserting his right to aid from the poor rate, but a question between one inhabitant of the parish, and the managers for the poor who had assessed him. A more recent and important case arose out of the commercial and manufacturing distresses of 1819, in the Abbey parish of Paisley, in which upwards of eight hundred able-bodied workmen (such as the persons who are now petitioning to be carried to Canada) applied for subsistence from the parish rates; and the managers for the poor having refused to give that relief, as being a precedent of extreme danger, the claimants presented an application to the sheriff of the county, for the purpose of having the claim made effectual. The sheriff decided that they had a legal claim; and the question being appealed to the supreme court, I have reason to know that it was deemed of great importance to prevent that question from being tried upon its merits, and to oppose it upon a preliminary objection in point of form, namely, the competency of the sheriff’s court to review or control the resolutions of the managers for the poor. The result was, that the Court of Session decided that although the Scottish Acts of Parliament, in various instances connected with the poor laws, imposed a superintending duty upon the sheriffs, the sheriff had no such control as had been assumed; so that the case was dismissed, and the question never was tried upon its merits. The circumstances of the manufacturing districts changed, and the funds of the claimants being exhausted, the case went no further.

1795. Then the apprehension that weighed upon one of the parties in that case, was, that if it came to be tried fairly on its merits before the Court of Session, that court would probably act as it had done in the case of Pollock against Darling?—I believe it was; and I may add, that if the principle involved in that case were once established by an authoritative precedent, as applicable to the maintenance, total or partial, of able-bodied workmen demanding it as a legal right, then it seems to me beyond all question that Scotland will be placed under the same tremendous burthen which England bears and has been struggling in vain to alleviate.

1796. Do you conceive that in deciding the case of Pollock against Darling, the Court of Session meant to confine itself to laying down the law in cases of general distress in the country, so that employment could not be found by the applicants, or that it only included cases of temporary and local distress?—I really do not feel myself very competent to answer, as to the reasons which influenced the case of Pollock against Darling, my knowledge of that case being derived from the printed report, which I have not recently perused; but my understanding is, that the main question did not come directly and fully before the court.

1797. Do you conceive that the effect of that decision in the case of Pollock against Darling was to go as far as a decision could go to establish this principle, that the incapacity of finding employment entitled a man to be put upon the poor’s roll in Scotland?—If it could be considered a sufficient precedent, it certainly does involve that principle; but it does not go to say directly that the able-bodied poor man has a legal claim against the parish, it only goes to this, which is a different thing, that if the managers of the poor, namely, the Kirk session, and the heritors or proprietors, (who as a sort of Parliamentary trust are invested with the management of the poor and the power of assessing parishes) shall

shall voluntarily admit such claims, a parishioner who is assessed will not be permitted to object.

1798. In the case of Pollock against Darling were not all the fifteen judges present, and the decision carried by a majority of one?—I am not able at present to answer that question.

1799. You have stated, that if the step were once taken, of admitting able-bodied men as possessing a good claim on the poor rates of Scotland, the condition of Scotland would be quite as bad as that of England?—Nearly as bad.

1800. Would it not be even worse, inasmuch as personal property is rateable to the poor in Scotland as well as real property?—I am not aware that that makes it worse.

1801. Is not a person residing in a parish in Scotland, where a rate exists, liable to contribute to the rate in consideration of his personal property wherever situated, as well as his real property within the parish?—I believe there is at present no doubt at all how the law of Scotland stands in that respect; and I may state, for the information of the Committee, that wherever an assessment is imposed, (suppose 2,000*l.*) the law divides it into two equal parts, 1,000*l.* will be payable exclusively by that body whom in Scotland we are in the habit of calling "heritors," a term not always to be limited to the proprietors of land, for it may happen in some parishes, and it does happen in the Abbey parish of Paisley, in which I live, that the proprietors of houses pay and rank as managers of the poor along with the landholders, whom they greatly out-number, and of course can out-vote; the other half is assessed on the inhabitants at large, including those very heritors, according to the estimated ratio of their "means of subsistence" wherever situated, and not otherwise assessed for poor rates. The Committee will understand that I am describing the mode of assessment in what are called "landward" parishes in Scotland, as distinguished from burgh parishes, in which last the mode of assessment is somewhat different.

1802. In regard to an early statute, as defining the persons to whom relief may be given, already referred to, are you not aware that in a subsequent statute in 1663, there are words to this effect: "The persons unemployed, being masterless, and out of service, and not having wherewith to maintain themselves by their own means and work, are entitled to relief"?—I do not recollect particularly the import of that statute; but the impression upon my mind is, that the terms referred to are not of general application, but directed to some special and probably temporary object.

1803. Supposing, for the sake of argument, it were admitted that an indiscriminate poor rate could by law be imposed in Scotland, is it not probable that, under the circumstances of distress and misery among the redundant able-bodied labourers in the county of Renfrew continuing in future years unaided and unassisted by that extent of charitable contribution from other parts of the country which combined with the charity of Renfrew, estimated at five thousand pounds, which has supported them for the last year, is it not probable that a legal assessment would take place in the county of Renfrew for the maintenance of the able-bodied poor, in the same manner as in England?—If it be assumed that the law were so declared, I have not the least doubt that in such a year as 1826 the Kirk sessions and heritors would be disposed to relieve the distressed work-people by a general assessment or poor rate; and if there were no other reason, there is at least this very strong one, that voluntary contributions fall chiefly upon those who are in other respects put to the greatest expense, namely, the charitable, and that many individuals can find very good reasons for keeping their money in their pockets.

1804. Though you have no doubt there would be a disposition on the part of the self-taxing body in Renfrew to impose this assessment, under the supposed circumstances of continued distress, they would have to exercise a discretion whether they would or not; and in point of fact, there would be no abstract means, under the law of Scotland, to force them to do it, if they were of opinion that it was inexpedient to give relief to the able-bodied labourer?—I would express my confident opinion, that if the power of assessing parishes for the indiscriminate support of all who happened to be in poverty, from fluctuations in employment or otherwise, in Scotland, it would be not only the interest of the landholders in particular, but of Scotland at large, that it should, so far as regards able-bodied men, be entirely discretionary, and such as vested no legal claims in those objects of it. I have thought in seasons of distress in Renfrewshire, such as the years

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

1816 and 1819, as well as 1826, that it might be desirable to vest the managers of the poor with a discretionary power to assess the whole parish for the relief of the general distress; but I certainly think we ought to be most careful of treating such relief as a matter of legal right in the claimant. The tendency of such a measure, humane as it seems, would soon appear. The salutary warning which the course of nature gives, in connecting distress with improvidence and vice, and the utility of saving banks and friendly societies, would be materially counteracted; and the effects, especially in a manufacturing district, would be debasement of moral feeling, and depreciation of real property. It may not be unimportant to add, that the debasement of which I speak has, in my own experience, made alarming progress, and chiefly from the immoderate appetite which prevails for spirituous liquors, and the excessive, and in my mind destructive facility with which licenses for retailing spirits can be obtained in Scotland by persons who have no other recommendation than that which ought rather to exclude them, viz. their poverty and unfitness for other employment. If habits of providence are so peculiarly necessary amidst the fluctuations incident to commercial and manufacturing pursuits, the Committee will judge how far such habits are discouraged; and what a large deduction must come from the wages of labour, when I state, that, as compared with the population, the number of licensed houses will show that every twentieth family in Renfrewshire keeps a public house, and by necessary consequence, that almost every working man is subjected to constant temptation, by having some relation, some intimate acquaintance, or some next-door neighbour, who keeps a tippling house.

1805. Admitting, then, for the sake of argument, that in consequence of some future decision, the law of Scotland, as laid down in the case of Pollock against Darling, were solemnly affirmed, that would lead to a state of things in which the redundant poor buying a legal claim upon parochial assessments, in the county of Renfrew for example, the indisposition which you have stated to exist to tax the county for the purposes of emigration would then be reduced to a consideration of comparative pecuniary interest, involved between paying this legal rate, which could not be avoided, and contributing towards the expense of emigration; you have already remarked that in England you understand that it may be a good bargain to the parish to pay 60*l.* for the getting rid of a labourer's family, which appears to cost the parish 25*l.* a year; admitting that the principle of the judgment alluded to was affirmed, do you think the same permanent objection would exist in the county of Renfrew to the proposition of charging emigration on the county rate, which under existing circumstances you think would practically occur?—If it were solemnly determined to be the law of Scotland, that an able-bodied man who could not find employment were entitled as a legal claim to demand support from the parish, we should then be precisely, or very nearly, on the same footing as England; of course what now appears to be surrounded with objections of the most formidable description, would then come to a mere consideration of comparative advantage or disadvantage in commuting one burden for another.

1806. If in 1819, the Court of Session, instead of getting rid of the question of the merits in the Abbey Parish case, and disposing of it on the point of the sheriff's jurisdiction, had affirmed the decision of the sheriff, what would have been the effect of a final judgment, so affirming the claim of able-bodied men in Scotland on the poor rate?—It appears to me that the effect of such an affirmation would be this, we should just have the same extent of claims, with all their injurious consequences, that exist in England, with this difference, so far as I understand any thing of the practice in England, that in Scotland the assessment will be imposed by the persons, or chiefly by the persons on whom the burden of payment principally falls, which I believe is not the case in England. But as an off-set for that advantage, we should be more exposed to such claims, because the conditions on which a legal settlement in Scotland is acquired are simple and easy compared with those which I understand to be established in England.

1807. Did not the decision of the sheriff of Renfrew confirm the claim of 825 able-bodied men?—In effect it did so. I wish it to be understood that the judgment referred to was not given by me, as is usually the case, in the first instance; it was given by a gentleman of much higher attainments, Mr. Dunlop, the principal sheriff, whose usual province it is to review my judgments when parties are dissatisfied. I was at that period much engaged in the management of voluntary contributions for indigent work-people, and too much in contact both with them

and

and the managers for the poor to make it desirable for me to judge in the question, and I requested the sheriff to do so.

1808. You have stated, that three years continued residence is necessary to settlement; are not the words of the Scotch law, that "haunting and resorting" for the space of three years should give a settlement?—I have been accustomed to consider the general law of settlement as so clear, that I did not think it necessary to peruse minutely the whole Acts of the Scottish Parliament preparatory to my examination; but I apprehend that the expressions referred to are applied to vagrants, and to questions of relief between one parish and another, and do not regulate the general law of settlement.

1809. Are you aware of the case of the parish of Rescobie, decided in 1801, where a common vagrant was held to have acquired a settlement in a parish where she had most haunted for the last three years, to the effect of making that parish liable to the maintenance of her bastard child?—I would observe, that although we have practically no law of removal in Scotland, we have an equivalent for it in daily practice. Wherever a person is found destitute in a parish, where such person has no legal settlement, the managers for the poor do not hesitate to administer relief to prevent starvation, but then they immediately notify this circumstance to the parish where the settlement exists, and have a right by law, as creditors, to compel that parish to repay their advances, and all future advances, or else to remove the chargeable person. I have not thought it necessary to mention to the Committee, how the settlement of parents governs that of their children, or of husbands that of their wives, or how the place of birth gives a settlement where no other ground of settlement is known. In the case of Rescobie, the vagrant mother's settlement (I believe) under a special enactment was found to fix upon one of a number of conflicting parishes the burden of supporting the destitute child. I believe the case does not affect the general rule.

1810. In a former part of your evidence you have stated, that great benefit would result from extending the period to seven years upon which a settlement might be obtained; will you have the goodness to state how that benefit would arise, if there was not at the same time a compulsory power of removal of those Irish, to whom reference has been made, when there is no parish in Ireland to which you can remove them?—In making any such proposition regarding settlement, I would accompany that proposition by another, for authority to remove in the most summary manner persons who were become chargeable upon the parish; and also, if practicable, to prevent the entrance of every person from Ireland, England, or any foreign country, coming in the character of a beggar or a vagrant.

1811. In the late period of distress in the neighbourhood of Glasgow, may there not have been several hundred families resident in that part of the country, now receiving relief, whom it might be very desirable to remove, and who have not resided seven years?—Yes.

1812. How could you make that power of removal practically applicable to those persons?—I am not wiser, from the state of the question, where the difficulty lies. I do not perceive why the managers of the poor may not give directions to have such particular families sent home by the steam boat, and to send a person with them; but wherever an Irish person has acquired a settlement, of course he must be regarded as settled in the fullest sense of the word, and it would be impossible with justice to make a retrospect.

1813. If you had in a populous district such as yours, four or five hundred families that it might be desirable to remove, do you conceive in point of fact you could carry such a law into strict effect, by removing these four or five hundred families by the force of law?—No; but in the course of the year ending this month, we have removed 1517 Irish persons from Paisley to Ireland, paying their passage home by a steam boat.

1814. Were they removed in a voluntary manner, or by the compulsion of law?—By a sort of moral compulsion. Some perhaps had acquired a settlement, and certainly many of them had not, but they found they could get no work, and we gave them the means of returning. This I believe was done in Glasgow to a still greater extent.

1815. What had been the period of the residence of those persons?—I presume the great majority of them had not acquired a settlement; but I have no means of answering the question more particularly.

1816. Had you any security against their return?—No, none at all, except that

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

security which must have arisen from their own fear of being immediately sent back if they should return in a period of scarcity of employment.

1817. If those persons came back, would they not at any time revive their claim of settlement?—I should suppose that a short absence in Ireland would not do that away.

1818. Do you concur with the evidence given by the preceding witnesses from Scotland, as to the fact, that a weaver utterly out of employment cannot be sustained with his family for less than twenty pounds?—I should suppose it would require twenty pounds to maintain such a family.

1819. Supposing distress to continue in Renfrew at the same rate as last year, and that no charity is extended to that county from other parts of the kingdom, do you not consider in point of fact that the same expense is unavoidably occasioned within that county as would be occasioned under a system of poor laws, provided that under such poor laws persons were only relieved to the extent of keeping them alive, and supposing that the charitable feelings of the county of Renfrew would induce voluntary subscriptions to the extent of keeping that population alive; in putting this question to you, you will have the goodness to understand that it is not meant to imply that the same persons would incur the same expense, but whether identically the same expense would not be under those terms imposed upon the county of Renfrew?—The expense of last year was really so great that I do not see how it is morally possible to levy in any kind of way by compulsory means 22,000*l.* upon so small a county as Renfrew; it would be considered a burthen quite intolerable; and I do not in the least doubt that if the humane supply we received from the south had been withheld, the contributions from the county of Renfrew itself could not have maintained those people, and that the consequences must have been starvation and disease, and probably disturbance. But I may add, that the supposition of such distress being renewed is one which will not be regarded as probable; there are at present but a small proportion of able-bodied artisans out of employment; the bulk of persons who remain burdens on the voluntary contribution fund managed by the County Committee, was last week about 900 families, of whom by far the greatest portion consists of persons unfit for emigration. I do not believe that any one of the persons petitioning to go to Canada is among the number.

1820. According to the law of Scotland at present, is settlement gained by apprenticeship?—No.

1821. In reference to your evidence on the present state of distress in Renfrewshire, are you of opinion that there would be no permanent distress in consequence of the present extent of its population, if the inconvenient influx of the Irish could be guarded against?—I certainly think that if natives of Scotland alone were concerned, there would be no surplus population.

1822. A person engaged in a manufacturing district as an apprentice, after residence with that manufacturer for seven years, does not gain a settlement?—If such person be a minor, and resident in family with his father, I think he would not gain a settlement; but if he had been what in Scotland we call "forisfamiliated," and earning his own livelihood, there is nothing in the circumstance of his being an apprentice which should prevent his gaining a settlement by industrial residence for three years.

1823. During the time of the apprenticeship, is it in the power of any person to remove an apprentice out of the parish?—Certainly not.

1824. Does it not then follow, that manufacturers in the manufacturing districts have the power of indefinitely extending the population by means of taking apprentices?—Unquestionably, if those apprentices come from another district. Work-people who are ill paid or unemployed in one place, will go to another where they expect to be better off; and manufacturers who require additional work-people will always command them by raising the wages.

1825. Is it not the interest of the manufacturer, in times when trade is going on well, to increase beyond his number of apprentices, without any view to the subsequent burthen there may be on the parish?—With reference to master manufacturers of muslin or of silk goods, there is no such practice known in Scotland as taking apprentices as between employer and weaver. In the silk and muslin trade, each web is the subject of a special contract with the weaver, who may have as many apprentices as he finds convenient. I ought to explain, that by the term apprentice, in Scotland, is usually, and I believe always meant, a beginner in some trade, under a written contract, which we call an "indenture," a term applied

applied in Scotland to no other instrument. And perhaps I may with propriety further mention, that complaints, in the course of my twenty-four years experience of Renfrewshire, have been made more than once in times of distress arising from low wages, that but for the expense of the indenture stamp duty, the practice of binding learners at the weaving trade for four or five years would become general, and would serve as a means of lessening the number of persons entering into the trade; the fact being, that many young men verbally agree to serve for a term of years, and after a year or two break their engagement (which is not legally binding) and set up for themselves. I thought the proposal deserving of consideration, as a very sensible remedy.

1826. As the law stands at present, supposing the redundant manufacturing population to be drawn off by emigration, would not the power on the part of masters to take apprentices, make the parish liable to the recurrence of an evil which they on their part have no power of preventing?—The circumstances of the question are very applicable to England, where I believe apprenticeships are supposed to create a settlement; but such is not the condition of Scotland; and in the trade of a weaver of silks or muslins, it is a matter of no importance whatever under what denomination those employed by him may pass, for journeymen or work-people engaged on any terms from a distance will just have the same rights and the same effect as if they had been indented apprentices. It is very clear that whenever a period of good trade and high wages occurs, there is an immediate influx of workers, some of them young men betaking themselves to that trade as a permanent means of subsistence; and when a reverse comes, some portion of that influx may be thrown upon the parish as persons who have acquired a legal settlement therein; but as already mentioned, if they are able-bodied persons, their claims would be resisted as matter of right, and their relief must depend on voluntary contribution.

1827. Do you consider that, supposing emigration to be an adequate relief at the present moment, any security can be devised against the recurrence of an evil produced in the manner above suggested; supposing emigration to be an adequate means of relief by raising wages, and supposing a market to exist for goods at a corresponding advance?—I think there might be some securities for the continuance of this state of things, but whether efficient securities I dare not venture to say.

1828. Would you not consider the circumstance of extending the period from three years to seven, as tending materially to remove this objection?—I certainly should, joined with a power of summary removal; and perhaps joined also with some regulations which might be adopted without a violation of the principle of free intercourse of the natives of the different parts of the United Kingdom, such as one which has been talked of, requiring of the masters of steam boats and other vessels navigating between the few ports that are on the contiguous coasts of Britain and Ireland, to take some parish certificate or passport from persons applying for passage to Scotland, bearing that they are not heggars or vagrants, but persons who have been accustomed to earn their own subsistence. Any plan, however, to stop the influx of poor Irish people must be attended with a great many difficulties; and in the case I have supposed, would probably be attended with a great many forged passes and certificates; a remedy applied in Ireland would be more effectual than any applied here.

1829. Supposing that after the 24th of May a very considerable number of persons were in a state of starvation, do you not conceive that the county would be ready to contribute more for the purposes of emigration than merely for their temporary support?—It would depend very much, I think, upon the extremity of the pressure, whether the county would be disposed to contribute or not; because in no ordinary circumstances do I think that the county of Renfrew would choose to establish such a precedent as might eventually bear against them at some future time. I feel perfectly sure they would not do it at present, the distress being so considerably abated.

1830. Do you not conceive that after the 24th of May there will be a very great mass of population in such a state, that emergency will exist to a great degree for some more effectual relief than merely temporary support?—I have no doubt some distressing cases will occur, but I have great hopes that they will not be to a very great, and certainly not to any alarming extent; and I am afraid, without mentioning any disparagement to the inhabitants of Renfrewshire, that nothing short

A. Campbell,
Esq.

24 March,
1827.

A. Campbell,
Esq.24 March,
1837.

of something alarming, from great numbers being out of work, will be sufficient to produce any renewed general contribution.

1831. You are really of opinion that there is not any great probability of a state of distress, such as you can call alarming, taking place at that period?—No, I think not.

1832. Then, in point of fact, as you are of opinion this distress is lessening, you must admit that the removal of a comparatively small number of families would mitigate the distress?—I think that the removal of a very small number just now will produce a greater effect than the removal of a much greater number three months ago.

1833. Then in bettering the wages of those that remain, removal will be better just now than three months before or after?—Three months ago there were multitudes of able-bodied weavers unemployed, now there are few of that class without some employment; but the wages of all, except the silk weavers, are low, and their means are too much exhausted, by previous distress, to enable them to encounter any further stagnation of trade that might occur. This being their condition, I think that if any thing is to be done by emigration, for improving that condition, it would be of importance to them that it should be done at the present rather than at a future time; for they have been all counting upon the probability of getting themselves sent out to Canada at this time; and I believe in many instances they have abstained from securing houses for the ensuing year, and many of them live in the houses of landlords who are not at all averse to get quit of tenants who pay them nothing.

1834. Therefore you are clearly of opinion that prior to the 24th of May will be the most advantageous period for commencing any experiment of this sort?—I am clearly of opinion that prior to the term of removal, which is the 15th of May old style, it would be most advantageous to carry into effect any project of emigration which may be deemed expedient.

1835. Have the goodness to state whether the relief which you now give to the poor in your neighbourhood has not very much diminished during the last week?—Our total expenditure, since the 22d day of February, has been 470*l.*; and the number of families now on the county committee list is 936, whereas the average for the previous period was 2,030 families, and the highest number at any time since the distresses began in Spring 1826 was 2,725 families. The proportion of Irish families has been about one-fourth; but if those who applied for a free passage back to Ireland be included, the proportion will exceed one half of the whole number upon the county fund. I am informed by a gentleman in Glasgow, conversant in such matters, that the proportion of Irish applicants in that city was considerably greater; but the distress in Glasgow was by no means so severely felt as in Paisley, where the great bulk of the population consists of operative manufacturers, and where the number of capitalists and the wealth is inferior in a very great degree.

1836. If an Irishman had resided three years continuously in Glasgow and obtained a settlement, and then went to Ireland for five years and came back again, would his settlement at once revive?—That is a doubtful point, as I conceive.

1837. Supposing a Scotchman absents himself from Scotland at any time, his settlement is in the last place where he has continuously resided for three years, is it not?—It is.

1838. Would not that apply to any other person who gained a settlement in the same manner as a Scotchman did?—Certainly.

1839. Therefore an Irishman having gained a settlement, and absenting himself for a time, can again regain a settlement?—If an Irishman resides fully three years in a parish in Scotland, and then goes away to Ireland and remains absent for a year or two, and then he comes back again and takes up his residence in another part of Scotland for a period less of three years, he will have acquired no right from his last residence. But as a matter of opinion, I should say that he had a right, in case of poverty, and in case of having gained an intermediate settlement elsewhere, to recur upon the place of settlement which he had gained in Scotland.

1840. Can the parish remove those persons who will be turned out of their houses in the month of May, if they are destitute of a place to go to?—They certainly cannot.

1841. Do you conceive that the case of *Pollock v. Darling* decides more than this;

this; that if the Kirk session and heritors, a body legally entitled to make a poor's rate, do make a rate for the support of able-bodied persons, their authority will be supported by the supreme court against persons refusing to pay?—I have already stated as well as I could, that so far as I have heard, the decision referred to has not been regarded as a precedent of much authority; it is a single decision, and does not set the question at rest.

1842. Supposing it a precedent entitled to full authority, does it decide more than that if a voluntary rate is made by the Kirk session and heritors, that rate will be supported by the supreme court?—Certainly there is no decision on any further point, but there is a further principle assumed, because if a man has no right to make an assessment, he has no right to make another pay it.

1843. Do you conceive there is any legal authority for the claim made as of right by able-bodied persons?—I regard the claim of an able-bodied person as an undecided case. I believe it is different in England, but in Scotland a single decision of the supreme Scottish court is not as a matter of course held to settle the law in a manner that may not be altered by another decision, given perhaps in a case more favourably circumstanced for trying an abstract point of law.

1844. The case of the Abbey parish does not decide more than that the sheriff has no power to review the decisions of the Kirk session and heritors as to relief?—It certainly decides no more.

1845. Therefore the sheriff's decision has no more weight than as his individual opinion?—It has no more.

1846. As Scotchmen get no settlement in Ireland, would it not be equitable to withhold it from Irish settlers in Scotland, to prevent the Scotch settlement giving undue encouragement to the influx of Irishmen into Scotland?—Certainly, that would be equitable.

1847. You said that you moved a large number of people from Paisley to Ireland; do you believe that if those persons had been in a country parish where there was no police and no power, those persons could have been induced to leave that parish if it had not been their own wish and choice?—They could only be removed by their own wish and choice, but this was exactly what was done in Paisley. The Irish feel that their residence and their claims are regarded with great jealousy, and they are probably either ignorant of the decision in the case of Higgins in the year 1824, or doubtful if it would be of avail to them; and such was the want of employment, that a free passage to Ireland, where they might be better, was their own choice. I apprehend that any parish who chose to say, You may go back to your own country or stay here without relief, might find the same effects to follow.

1848. In the event of a cotton mill failing, and any large number of persons being suddenly thrown out of employment, they could not be removed by a person paying the rate?—If they have been resident for three years, there is no power to remove them.

1849. Although this question may, in substance, have been put to you before, the Committee are anxious to put it again in a more specific manner; supposing that the present redundant paupers of Renfrew could be removed from that county in consequence of every other county adjoining being utterly unable to give them employment, and supposing that all assistance from charity was limited to the county of Renfrew itself, would there, in your opinion, be any difference in the situation of the county of Renfrew now, and the situation of the county of Renfrew under the system of poor laws, provided that charity on the one hand induces the inhabitants of the county not to allow any to perish for want of food entirely, maintaining them at the lowest possible quantity of food that can keep human existence alive, and on the other, supposing that under a compulsory poor rate subsistence was limited by precisely the same terms, namely, just enough to keep a person alive; do you consider, under the terms of this proposition, that there would be any difference in the situation of the county of Renfrew under those circumstances, though in the one instance the expense would fall upon the charitable, and in the other would fall upon the proprietors landed and personal property?—In so extreme a case as that supposed, where the consequences must be starvation and disease, and probably disturbance, the danger comes home to every man's door, and extraneous aid being excluded, self-preservation would doubtless supersede all other considerations, and induce the inhabitants at large to contribute to avert or alleviate such evils; and the only difference which I conceive between the two cases of voluntary charity, and compulsory, will be in favour of the latter

*A. Campbell,
Esq.*

*24 March,
1827.*

mode, because it would operate more equally, whereas the other would fall too exclusively on the humane. But I have already stated that a difference of opinion exists respecting emigration, and that many will be disposed to object to that remedy, not only because they may doubt the permanency of its effects, but because they regard the evil as a national one, intimately connected as it is with the over-peopled state of Ireland; and what passed at certain county meetings several months ago, gave sufficiently strong indications that many landholders will consider it hard to pay a local tax to remedy such an evil, and especially as it involves a dangerous precedent. I have, however, had no recent opportunity of ascertaining the sentiments of the landholders on that part of the subject, not even of those who are members of this Committee, preparatory to my examination; and in what relates to opinion merely upon the political part of a subject so important (upon which, owing to peculiar circumstances, I found myself unable to derive that benefit which would have been desirable from the views of others, subsequent to receiving the unexpected order to attend this Committee) I would express my wish that the Committee would rather look to the facts which I have stated, than to any immature or speculative opinions which, with much diffidence, I may have given in answer to the questions put to me by the Committee.

Martin, 27^a die Martii, 1827.

[Sir Henry Parnell, Bart. a Member of the Committee, made the following Statement:]

STATEMENT delivered in by Sir Henry Parnell, on the
Population of Ireland.

*Sir
Henry Parnell.*

*27 March,
1827.*

* Vol. 4. p. 483.

THE new abridgement of "Philosophical Transactions," contains a paper, written by Captain Smith, who made an enumeration of the people of Ireland, in the year 1695. By this it appears, that the population of Ireland amounted in that year to 1,034,102*. Captain Smith had the means of acquiring correct information on the subject, in consequence of his being at that time a Commissioner of the Revenue in Ireland, and of his having to carry into execution an Act for collecting a Poll Tax.

In 1792, Dr. Beaufort computed the population of Ireland to amount to 4,088,226. This calculation was made upon the number of houses contained in the returns of the Hearth Money collectors. He allowed six persons to a house.

According to the census made in the year 1821, the number of people in Ireland at that time, was 6,801,827. In several instances in which actual enumerations have since been made, it has appeared that the numbers contained in the census were less than they ought to have been. If Dr. Beaufort's calculation had been made at the rate of five persons to a house, the number of people in Ireland in 1792 would have been 3,406,365; and therefore, as there appear to be good reasons for supposing that Dr. Beaufort's estimate was too high, and the census of 1821 too low, it may not be far from correct to come to the conclusion, that in the thirty years preceding 1821, the population of Ireland was doubled.

The population of Ireland in 1821 being known, and also the rate at which it had increased up to that time, it is not difficult to decide, with tolerable accuracy, what the amount of it is at the present time. The immediate cause of the increase of population, is the excess of the births above the deaths; and the rate of increase, or the period of doubling, depends upon the proportion which the excess of the births above the deaths bear to the whole population. The excess of births is occasioned by and in proportion to three causes; 1st, The prolificness of the marriages; 2d, The proportion of the born which lives to marry; 3d, The earliness of those marriages, compared with the expectation of life.

Unless it can be shown that some checks have arisen to the progress of population in Ireland since 1821, that did not exist there before, it is reasonable to conclude that the increase of population has been going on at least at the rate at which it had gone on before 1821, that is, at the rate of doubling in thirty years.

According to the Tables of Population, it appears that when the rate of increase is that of doubling in thirty years, the per-centage increase for ten years will be 25 and 5-tenths, or 300,000 per million*; this will make the increased population

* Sup. Enquiry. Statistics.
Vol. 6. p. 333.

population in ten years, from 1821 to 1831, 2,100,000, without adding the increase on each year's increase. So that the total population will, probably at least, amount in four years more, that is in 1831, to above nine millions.

The great increase of population in Ireland has so much outrun the increase in the funds for employing it, as to occasion the almost universal prevalence of the most squalid and abject poverty, and to justify an opinion, that a check to the further progress of population has begun to have operation by emigrations to Great Britain, and by increased mortality, arising from the inability of the people to obtain such supplies of the coarsest and cheapest food as are necessary to support their existence.

Although it may be difficult to obtain positive proof by evidence, of any of the foregoing conclusions, a great deal of light may be thrown upon the subject, by calling intelligent witnesses before the Committee, to state principles and facts connected with the causes of the prodigious increase of population in Ireland—the checks that may have arisen to it, and the actual condition of the people, as to their means of subsistence, and as to the extent of disease and mortality.

If it should appear that certain statements, which have lately been published, are true, namely, of numbers of people dying daily from the impossibility of obtaining subsistence, the excess of population must be so great, as to make it hopeless to establish security and tranquillity in Ireland, or to prevent England and Scotland from being overrun by Irish labourers by any ordinary means.

Under such circumstances, a case will be established, to show the necessity of the interference of the Legislature: The grounds will be laid to justify and call for the carrying on of Emigration from Ireland, on a large scale, at the public expense; and also for such measures as will make sure of preventing the vacancies occasioned by it, from being filled up.

[A. C. Buchanan, Esq. being again called in, delivered in the following Paper; and the same was read:]

SPECIFICATION of RATIONS of PROVISIONS, and other matters, to be furnished Emigrants; with the Prices at which they will be charged, and on repayment again credited, giving option to Emigrants to give the Cash.

A. C. Buchanan,
Esq.

FULL RATIONS:				These are the prices at the Settlement.
1 ½ lb. of Flour	-	-	2 ½ d.	
½ - - - Pork	-	-	2	
2 oz. of Molasses or Sugar	-	-	4	
5 ½ d. per day.				

For man, wife, and 3 children, three rations, at 15 ½ d.

per day, for 450 days, are	-	-	-	£. 29 10 7
Deduct, cow's milk	-	-	-	1 10 7
				£. 28 - -

Probable Prices of Provisions
at Montreal:

Flour - \$6	- -	£. 1 5 6	per barrel
Beef - \$9	- -	2 7 3	-
Pork - 12 to 16	-	2 19 6	-
Indian Meal - 3 ½	-	14 10	-
W. I. Sugar - 2 15	-	-	per cwt.

Not knowing the exact situation in which provisions may be made, the cost of transport cannot be now reckoned on, but I presume the prices charged for the daily rations will cover it.

N.B. Under the head of Flour, I include such other farinaceous food as might be thought advisable to substitute occasionally; and during the winter months, the allowance of meat might be changed for fresh Beef, which would be a small saving, as it would be had for about 1 ½ d. per lb.

I would only recommend cows to families having children, or one cow between two men and their wives.

A. C. Buchanan,
Esq.

87 Marsh,
1897.

Under any circumstances the disbursement should not exceed the sum stated in the estimate; and such deductions as could possibly be effected, should be made by the Superintendent with the concurrence of the settler. Under the head of Incidents, is included medical assistance.

It will be indispensable to have a large contingent fund to set off against numerous accidents which must, from the nature of the business, be unavoidable.

Lieut. Thomas Charles White again called in; and Examined.

Lieut.
T. C. White.

1850. THE Committee understand you wish to correct some part of your evidence?—Yes.

1851. You allude to your answer to Question 459?—My answer to that question is merely an assent to a general proposition, it ought not therefore to be considered as having any application to the actual state of the Cape. There are also some other alterations which I wish to make in explanation of my answer to question 1450: I beg to observe, that being quite sure that it was not my intention to state "that the tendency of the supply of produce was to become redundant" under existing circumstances, I conceived the question to involve a supposititious case only like the one that preceded it, and the first part of my answer was given under that impression; the latter part of the answer applies to the real state of the colony with respect to labour, and from that I conceive it would appear to the Committee, that the supply of produce had not the least tendency at present to become redundant.

With respect to the resources and capabilities of the colony, and to the advantages which it derives from its geographical position for the supply of other countries with its productions, I beg to state that I perfectly concur with the Witnesses who have described them; but a residence in the colony of four years had taught me, that those natural advantages are not sufficient of themselves to insure success to the Emigrant who may venture his property in a farming speculation there, and I did not therefore feel myself at liberty to make any representation to the Committee which had no better foundation than mere general principles or the assumption of a total change in the system of administration.

That a limited number of labourers would be gladly received by the colonists, I have not the least doubt; nor have I any hesitation in saying, that the success of a portion of the pauper population of this country, if established there as small proprietors, would be equally certain, to the extent at least of an abundant supply of the necessaries of life; and beyond this I did not feel that I should be justified in going in my evidence before the Committee.

If consistent with the forms and practice of the Committee, I respectfully request that this explanation may be appended to my evidence, in order to obviate any further misapprehension of its precise and limited application. The circumstance of my being called upon to give evidence quite unexpectedly will, I trust, form a sufficient apology for the trouble I now occasion in endeavouring to correct its deficiencies.

Mr. George Thompson, called in, and Examined.

Mr.
George Thompson.

1852. HAVE you had an opportunity of reading the evidence given by former Witnesses to this Committee, relative to Emigration to the Cape of Good Hope?—I have hastily gone through them.

1853. You are the author of a publication that has lately appeared, entitled, "Travels and Adventures in Southern Africa, by George Thompson, Esq. eight years a resident at the Cape; comprising a view of the present state of the Cape with observations on the prospects of the British Emigrants"?—Yes.

1854. Do you generally concur in opinion with the witnesses as to the point, of the settlers being disposed to pay back at the rate of 3*l.* per annum the expense of the Emigrants who may be introduced there as labourers to a certain extent?—Yes, I do, generally.

1855. Do you feel any doubt there will be any practical difficulty in making that arrangement, provided that the number of labourers does not exceed the real demand for labour at the Cape?—I have no doubt of it.

1856. Is there much ungranted land in the country which, in your opinion, is favourable for cultivation by European labourers?—Yes, there is.

1857. Have

Mr.
George Thompson.
17 March,
1827.

1857. Have you any intention of returning to the Cape at an early period?—I have.

1858. Are you of opinion, in case of a supply of labourers proportioned to the wants of the colonies being sent to the Cape, that a great number of European labourers would be ultimately employed in the colony?—I have no doubt of it.

1859. You are acquainted with the detail of the arrangement, viz. that the emigrant should receive 1 s. a day and be fed, and that he should enter into a bond with the settler, and that the settler binds himself to pay 3 l. a year, which is one-fourth more than what he pays the labourer, to the government, as an annual instalment for the repayment of the money advanced?—Yes.

1860. Are you of opinion that it would be more expedient that all those emigrants, when they land in the country, should be bound to the government and let out to the colonists upon those terms, rather than that the colonist should put himself in relation with the emigrant?—I think it would be very desirable to be bound out by the government; they would conceive they would be better supported, and the master would have more dependence upon the contract.

1861. Have you ever known any instance of an arrangement of this sort having succeeded?—I am not aware of any at this moment.

1862. Are you of opinion that the present exports of the Cape of Good Hope may be most materially increased under circumstances of labour being rendered cheaper by the introduction of emigrants?—I am.

1863. Will you shortly explain to the Committee to what product you refer, and to what markets, as absorbing those products?—The present articles of produce are wines, ostrich feathers, hides, ivory, tallow, skins, gum and aloes, and salted provisions; the articles of cotton and silk might be introduced, if labour was more reasonable; and corn might be exported, although that has not taken place for some time.

1864. You have stated in your publication, p. 412, that the wool of European sheep appears to have degenerated; have you any subsequent information as to the result of later experiments to improve the quality of the wool at the Cape of Good Hope, or are all the districts equally unfavourable?—I have no doubt it will succeed in the district of Graaffreinet, and in Albany also.

1865. Have you had an opportunity of forming any decided opinion as to the cultivation of silk?—I have had some communication with the British and Irish Colonial Silk Company, and I am in hopes they will establish a party immediately, to proceed there.

1866. Can you inform the Committee as to the prospect of any extensive market opening for wheat to the Brazil, Mauritius, or any other country?—The Mauritius, Saint Helena, Brazil, and even Cape Town for Albany produce; this country also presents a market for corn.

1867. Are you of opinion that in any part of the interior of the Cape district, cotton could be cultivated with advantage?—I have no doubt it might be, with great success.

1868. By Europeans?—Yes.

1869. Has your attention been particularly turned to the detail of all those articles?—Not those latterly mentioned; but I know the quarter where the cotton has been tried, and has succeeded to their expectations, only the labour is too expensive for the cultivation of it.

1870. You have stated, that in your opinion the cultivation of wool might be made a very profitable cultivation at the Cape, under due management?—No doubt of it.

1871. What number of pauper emigrants, as labourers, do you think the Cape could absorb, without the danger of overstocking it?—I should think five or six hundred might be sent the first year, judging from the readiness with which Mr. Ingram got rid of his people, when they arrived in the colony.

1872. When you say five or six hundred, what proportion of women and children do you calculate?—A third or a fourth of women and children, or a half.

1873. You are acquainted with the general result of the emigration of 1820?—Yes.

1874. Although it may not have answered some of the capitalists who embarked in it, do you consider it has answered to the poor population that belong to it?—Entirely so, beyond all expectation; I hold in my hand documents that will show that.

Mr.
George Thompson.
27 March,
1837.

1875. Have you in your hand the documents, showing in detail the success of the different pauper settlers at that period?—I have.

1876. Is that in Albany?—Yes.

1877. The Committee see one person there stated to possess 200 head of cattle; have you the means of knowing whether that person came out as a pauper?—I believe without any means whatever, as many others, cloth-weavers, tailors, shoemakers, and others, are in possession of from a small number up to 400 head of cattle at this moment.

1878. Have any of the settlers grown wheat with success?—No, the rust having attacked the crops for the first two or three years, it has not been so much attended to.

1879. Have they grown wheat since with more success?—I have not ascertained in the last two years, whether they have or not.

1880. Have you had an opportunity of examining the details given in of the expense at which it would be necessary to locate the paupers at the Cape?—I have observed it, and I think it is very near correct.

1881. Have you any doubt whatever that if a pauper were located at the Cape, in the manner stated by preceding witnesses, that at the end of seven years he would be able to pay, without the slightest difficulty, at the rate of 3*l*. per annum as interest upon the money advanced to him?—With the greatest ease, I have no doubt.

1882. State your ground for that opinion?—I refer generally to those documents, and they will show that some of the paupers sent from Nottingham are doing well, and in possession of considerable property; I allude to them particularly, because they were paupers. The paper I have in my hand will illustrate my meaning.

[The Witness delivered in the following Paper:]

Instances of individual success of the Emigrants of 1820, going out without capital, some as paupers:

Trade.	Now in possession of
A. B. glass-cutter - - -	95 head of cattle.
C. D. umbrell-maker - - -	70 - d ^s , 2 boxes,
F. G. clothworker - - -	150 sheep and goats.
H. K. weaver - - -	100 head of cattle, 1 horse, 1 waggon, and 1 plough.
I. M. d ^s - - -	21 head of cattle, 25 sheep and goats.
	38 head of cattle, 1 waggon, 1 plough.

1883. Did not some of the people from Nottingham return?—Yes, five of them; but while they were there they earned so much as to pay their passage home.

1884. Was not there very great distress for a considerable period among those persons sent out in the year 1820?—I have no doubt there was considerable distress.

1885. For two years or more?—More perhaps.

1886. Those paupers you allude to, did not give a good account of the settlement?—No, it was on account of the rust, but that has disappeared, and they were not at all acquainted with the localities of the country.

1887. You spoke of the capabilities of the colony to produce cotton; you limit that to some part only?—It has been tried only in the Cape district; how it will succeed on the frontiers, or in Albany, I do not know.

1888. Has it been tried upon a large scale?—No, only in a garden or so.

1889. The eastern coast is the finest part?—Yes.

1890. Has it ever been attempted to cultivate tobacco?—Yes; but it is not allowed to come to this country, or we could supply nearly half the country.

1891. Is it grown to any extent?—Yes, for colonial consumption.

1892. When you say it is prohibited, you mean the duty is too high?—No, it is prohibited.

1893. Do you export any tobacco?—No, I do not think we do.

1894. For how many years has it been cultivated at the Cape?—Above 100 years or more among the Dutch; every farmer cultivates for his own consumption, throughout the colony.

1895. Is

1895. Is there any exportation of dried fruit from the Cape?—Yes.
 1896. To any extent?—There is a considerable supply sent to St. Helena and New South Wales; and also the ships from India, touching for supplies, carry off considerable quantities.

Mr.
George Thompson.
 27 March,
 1827.

1897. That dried fruit is very good, of its kind?—Yes.
 1898. When did you leave the Cape?—Twelve months ago.
 1899. What was the price of wheat per quarter, in British money, at that time?—About 6s. or 7s. the Winchester bushel; it got up almost immediately after to 10s. or 12s.

1900. And yet you anticipate an export of wheat to this country?—In due time, when labour is more reasonable.

1901. Does not the dearth of wheat arise from the dearthness of labour?—Principally it does; but it is also owing to the restrictions upon the corn, not allowing it to be exported when there is the least idea of a short crop, and there is no stimulus to the farmer to cultivate it.

1902. Have you ever engaged any persons to go from this country?—No, I am a merchant in Cape Town.

1903. In the case of indentured labourers, do you apprehend there would be any difficulty in enforcing the indentures?—I think not.

1904. Do you think the colonists would like to take the responsibility of enforcing the indenture upon themselves?—I am not able to answer that question; I think better evidence has been given upon that subject.

1905. What is your impression?—I think they would.

1906. You think no discontent would be created in the mind of the indentured emigrant, by the difference between his wages and the wages of the free colonist?—That is to be considered; the terms are in favour of the master.

1907. You think the master would have it amply in his power to enforce the indenture?—Yes.

1908. Do you know the terms upon which indentured labourers have been hitherto engaged?—Mr. Ingram's men went out, and they had to refund, the males 22*l.* and the females, I believe, 15*l.* and the children 11*l.*

1909. You have stated, that persons going upon those terms have become independent?—Many of Mr. Moody's men, who were taken out at a previous time, have become in very good circumstances.

1910. Do you conceive that the same good fortune would attend persons who went out under the lower rate of engagement now proposed?—I have no doubt of it.

1911. Their gains in the first year would not be the same, would they?—No, of course not.

1912. In the paper you have given in, as proving the success of the pauper emigrants, the Committee observe that almost all those persons stated to be successful are following particular trades?—Some of them are; but there are other documents, which I have given in.

1913. Have you any idea of the number of white inhabitants in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope?—About 70,000.

1914. The blacks?—Hottentots, free blacks and slaves, near 50,000.

Mr. Richard Webster Eaton, called in; and Examined.

1915. WILL you be good enough to explain to the Committee your connexion at the Cape of Good Hope?—I resided there as a merchant seven years and a half.

Mr.
R. W. Eaton.

1916. When did you leave it?—In April last.

1917. Have you had an opportunity of reading the evidence given before this Committee?—Yes.

1918. And have heard the evidence of to-day?—Yes, pretty generally; and I concur in the evidence I have read, so far as I am able to judge of it; but having chiefly resided in Cape Town, and been engaged in commercial pursuits, I possess but limited information as to the circumstances of location, never having visited the settlement.

1919. Are you able to form a decided opinion as to the disposition that would exist on the part of the colonists of the Cape, to consent to repay the expense of the passage of the labourer there, by paying so much per annum?—I apprehend

Mr.
R. W. Estlin.

27 March,
1827.

they are not the parties who could object; the settler himself sent out would be the only party to make an objection to it, it would be immaterial to the master.

1920. Are you of opinion that the colonists at the Cape, upon the terms of having an emigrant settler bound to him for five years for *g*l. a year, would be, in consideration of receiving such a settler, consent to pay *3*l. a year to the local authorities of the Cape for the re-payment of the expense incurred by that emigrant?—I should think he would very readily concur, so long as the two sums together would only amount to a reasonable rate of wages.

1921. When you say, provided the two sums together do not amount to above a reasonable rate of wages, do you contemplate placing the emigrant, after deducting that repayment, in a state in which he can maintain himself with comfort?—Of course.

1922. Do you consider that *g*l. a year is a fair remuneration for labour at the Cape, with subsistence?—I should presume it is, although I believe at the same time it is considerably below the present rate of wages.

1923. Have you any means of knowing, of your own knowledge, that *g*l. a year, with food, will provide the labouring servant with not only the necessities, but comforts of life?—I should think it amply sufficient in the country districts, provided that he is subsisted; I should think it sufficient to find him with clothing and other little comforts that might be necessary.

1924. Would he be able out of that sum to save as much money at the expiration of his term of indenture, as would enable him to become a small farmer or occupier?—No, he would not be able to save anything out of that.

1925. At the expiration of the term of his indenture he would be penniless?—Yes, unless he happened to be very prudent; I apprehend the wages are unusually low in comparison with the rate of wages in the colony.

1926. You have stated that you were a merchant in Cape Town?—Yes.

1927. You do not intend to apply the rate of wages, of *g*l. a year, to the inhabitants of Cape Town, but to the inhabitants of the newly settled districts?—Yes; but I have understood that the rate of wages in the new settlement are much higher than in Cape Town.

1928. What do you understand that to be?—Four or five shillings a day; but I ought to state that I am very imperfectly informed upon those subjects; I have never visited the frontier, and it is only from casual conversations upon the subject I am able to form any judgment whatever, and I should be very diffident in expressing an opinion.

1929. Is there any demand for manual labour beyond what can be supplied at Cape Town?—Yes, I think there is.

1930. What is the ordinary rate of wages to a household servant in Cape Town, of the lower class?—Thirty or forty shillings a month.

1931. That includes subsistence?—Yes.

1932. Do you think there would be any readiness on the part of the inhabitants of Cape Town to take a number of persons of that description, and paying a certain sum per annum in the shape of repaying their expenses?—I question if the inhabitants of Cape Town would be willing to take indentured household servants.

1933. From the general impression you receive at the Cape, as well as your own observation, are you of opinion the resources of the Cape would be materially increased under the circumstance of the introduction of labour proportioned to the demand?—I think so.

1934. Do you know of any circumstance that would be likely to be of equal advantage to the Cape?—No, I know of no other; when I say it seems to me to be so desirable, I feel some doubt in my own mind on the subject of indenturing the emigrants for a period of five or seven years; it has appeared to me that considerable disputes and discontent have existed in those cases where emigrants have been so indentured; and I think that the indentured servants might perhaps be dissatisfied if they found they were bound for a period of five or seven years at a rate of wages much below that which they could obtain were they at liberty to carry their labour elsewhere.

1935. But you are aware, by the terms of the proposition, that they would not be removed from their own country unless they consented to such arrangement?—Yes.

1936. And do you not conceive that when that was made a ground for them to get rid of their present sufferings and distresses, that their objection would be diminished to such an arrangement?—Yes; but if they felt they could earn more

wages

wages if they were not indentured, they would rather undertake to repay the 3*l*. themselves to government, and be at liberty then to find employment wherever they could.

1937. In point of fact you would concur with Mr. Thompson in opinion, that to consign them as it were to the government, and to leave a discretion as to the manner of disposing of them there, securing in one way or the other the payment of the money, would be the wisest course?—I should have an objection to consign them to the government, and allow the government to apprentice them to the colonists; there has been a good deal of dissatisfaction as to the disposal of Prize Apprentices under those circumstances, and it might afford opportunities that would tend to create much dissatisfaction if the government had the disposal of them.

1938. Do you not think some principle might be established, such as drawing lots, or some other, so as to make it impossible that any principle of favouritism could be applied?—Yes, I think it possible some such plan might exist, but there would be no party between the government and the settler in those cases; I think the settler in all probability would be dissatisfied if he were at the disposal of others for a long period; if the period were short, it would be of little consequence; if he was apprenticed for twelve months, to find a provision for him at his arrival at the colony, and at the end of twelve months, if he was at liberty to seek employment where he could find it, only compelling his master at all times to reserve so much of his wages as should amount to 3*l*. per annum, I think he would perhaps be placed under more favourable circumstances, and certainly feel his freedom and independence; for a man, after he has passed through a certain period of life, will not be satisfied at being apprenticed for so long a period as five years; those are the impressions that have occurred to me.

1939. Do you not think if a settler was to go into the interior, at the end of the first year there would be a great difficulty in marking his course and obtaining the money?—I think through the local authorities he could always be traced; a man is not easily lost at the Cape.

1940. Would it not be a difficult thing from a remote part of the country, to obtain those 3*l*. from the master?—No, I think not, through the local authorities; they are intimately acquainted with the particular individuals who compose the inhabitants of their respective districts.

1941. Can you state the price of day labour in Cape Town itself?—It varies very much, according to the nature of the employment; mechanics get higher wages than day labourers; but I believe the wages fluctuate from perhaps about fifteen or sixteen pence per day to double that sum.

1942. Is that sufficient for the comfortable subsistence of a labourer?—Yes, I think quite so; the provisions are comparatively very cheap in the colony, although they are dearer in Cape Town. European labourers generally get much higher wages than the colonial labourers, if their conduct is good.

1943. They work harder!—They are considered to be better workmen and more attentive to their work, and do not require so much looking after. I believe the following Scale a tolerably correct statement of the price of labour in Cape Town:

	R. d ^s .
Coolies, for job work - - - -	2 p ^d diem.
Men employed in wine stores - - -	20 s ^d 30 p ^d month.
Masons - - - - -	average 1 <i>½</i> p ^d diem.
Gardeners - - - - -	about 15 p ^d month, and subsistence.
Domestic male servants - - - -	15 s ^d 30 — —
D ^s - female d ^s - - - - -	10 s ^d 20 — —

Prize apprentices, whose apprenticeships have expired, obtain from 5 s^d 10 R. d^s per month, with subsistence and clothing.

But the money price of native labour in the colony, compared with that of European labour in this country, is not a just comparison; a workman or labourer in England, from his superior skill and greater activity, produces I apprehend at the least double the work of a colonial workman or labourer in the same portion of time.

There is also a great distinction amongst the slaves and prize apprentices, with respect to their qualifications for work and domestic service, which produces a corresponding distinction in the rate of wages.

Mr.
R. W. Estlin.

27 March,
1897.

The Malays are a much more active and efficient class of servants in every capacity than the Negroes; but as I have just stated, the European, *as we find him in this country*, is superior to the Malay, although he generally retrogrades in the colony, from the prevalence of moral depravity, the habit he acquires of assumed superiority over the coloured population, and the temptations to idleness, arising from the warmth of the climate and the indolence and indifference which he observes to prevail amongst the working classes of the colony; notwithstanding which, I believe the wages of Europeans to be in general higher than that of the natives.

1944. In the case you have just now submitted to the Committee, how would you provide in the event of a family going out, consisting of a man and his wife and three children; suppose a man became a servant upon the terms just now proposed, how would his wife and children be provided for in the mean time?—If he is indentured for twelve months, in order to make an immediate provision to meet his arrival in the colony, his family should be attached to him, that those who take him should take his family; otherwise I do not see how they are to be provided for.

1945. Do you think the colonists will object to take a man under those circumstances, or would they have any use for the woman?—In some cases they would be glad of females; I suppose the parties would have made their engagement before they went, so that they would go out pre-engaged.

1946. You think that the sort of emigration you propose, would be much more suitable to single men than to families?—Yes, I should think so; but I have understood there is a considerable want of female servants in the Albany district.

With regard to the printed Evidence, I think the evidence of Lieutenant White, relative to the price of wheat, is erroneous; the price of wheat at Cape Town, in 1819, is stated to be 3s. a bushel; I believe the price of wheat at Cape Town, at that period, was not less than 7s. 6d. or 8s. a bushel, the average price was 160 six dollars per load, which is 16 dollars a muid; a dollar is 18 pence, and there are three bushels to the muid; I think it must have been an error in transcribing the evidence. I observe that a question was asked Mr. Ellis, whether 80s. a quarter was the general price of wheat in the colony; it is a difficult thing to say the general price of wheat in the colony, as it has latterly undergone such astonishing fluctuations in consequence of the failure of the crop; but if you exclude the unfavourable seasons, from 30s. to 37s. 6d. a quarter will be found to be the average price, but it has been of course very much higher in the scarce seasons; at about 60s. a quarter is the point, below which the government exclude the introduction of foreign wheat. Foreign wheat is not permitted to be imported at the Cape of Good Hope when the colonial wheat is below 160 dollars a load, which is about 60s. a quarter. I also observe that Lieutenant White has stated, that there is no market for the surplus produce of the colony; I conceive he meant the surplus wheat; I should presume he meant to confine his observations to wheat; and at the time he was there, I conceive, there was no possibility of exporting it if they had been able to raise a surplus of wheat; but it is very well known there are various markets for the produce of the Cape of Good Hope, and markets that would take off any quantity of corn that could be produced, the Mauritius, the Brazil, and Saint Helena; the Mauritius has no wheat, except what she gets from the Cape of Good Hope and India, and the Cape of Good Hope wheat is so superior to Indian wheat, that she always prefers it when she can get it; and whenever the price of wheat at the Cape of Good Hope is at or below 100 six dollars per load, it forms a safe remittance to the Isle of France.

1947. How is the quality of wheat, compared with English wheat?—Very superior; I believe there is no wheat superior to it in the world.

1948. Is wheat bread the food of the common people in the Cape?—Yes, except in cases of failure; the failure of the crops occasioned the introduction of barley bread among the inhabitants of the distant parts of the colony.

1949. Is maize cultivated?—Yes, to a limited extent; and I have often thought, as there happens occasionally so great a scarcity of export corn, the colonists would do well to cultivate maize and rye as in North America, and adopt it for the use of the colony, which is said to be the finest bread made.

1950. Do potatoes succeed?—Not very well.

1951. Does not the sweet potatoe succeed?—It succeeds very well in the colony.

1952. Is

1952. Is it used to any considerable extent?—Yes.

1953. Have you ever heard whether the introduction of a new sort of wheat would prevent the accident of the rust?—I have heard that opinion expressed, and it has been tried with success in some instances.

1954. If it should not be the case, would it not appear very desirable that the staple food of the country should be maize or some other corn not liable to this accident, so as to leave wheat an article of export when a good crop?—Yes, that is my opinion; but I do not know whether the colony is not too dry for the cultivation of maize, as an article of general culture.

1955. Have you ever heard an opinion given of the capacity of parts of the colony to grow cotton?—Yes; I am not aware of any local advantages as to the growth of it, but I have heard opinions expressed in favour of its success where it has been undertaken, but I am not aware of any experiments having been tried to any great extent.

1956. Do you think tobacco could be made an article of export, if not prohibited?—I do not know that I can give an opinion upon it; the tobacco grown in the colony is very inferior to American tobacco.

Jouis, 29^e die Martii, 1827.

William Fielden, Esq. called in; and Examined.

1957. YOU reside near Blackburn, in the county of Lancaster?—I do.

1958. Are you intimately acquainted with the state of the lower classes of the population in that neighbourhood?—Yes; from having resided there during the whole time of the distress, I think I can speak to the situation of the country.

1959. Is the population manufacturing or agricultural, or combined of both?—Principally manufacturing, very little agricultural, that is, principally grass land, and very little ploughing.

1960. Are those grass lands divided into very small farms?—Yes, generally speaking, they are very small farms; forty, fifty, and sixty to one hundred pounds a year.

1961. Has it been very much the case in that neighbourhood for a small farmer to eke out his subsistence by hand-loom weaving, himself and his family?—Yes, their rents have been generally paid from their dependence upon the hand-loom weaving; they place very little confidence in their farms.

1962. Do you consider that the hand-loom weaving in that district is now almost entirely at an end, as a means of subsistence?—Yes, I should consider so, that there is nothing like a remunerating price now for hand-loom weaving; had it not been for the assistance which has been afforded by the Relief Committee, and charitable contributions of various sorts, the country must have been in a state of complete starvation; there are two very extensive hundreds, the higher and lower division of Blackburn hundred.

1963. Do you conceive there is any probability, in the present state of the trade, of any revival of the hand-loom work?—No, I have no distinct prospect of any relief being afforded.

1964. Do you think there is any probability of a greater demand for cotton goods than exists at present?—I see no channel or prospect whatever of any improvement we can rely upon.

1965. What effect upon the poor rates, in that part of the country, has been produced by the great depression of the hand-loom weaving trade?—I am not able to speak as to what the poor rates are at present, they very exceedingly in every township; but I have known one or two instances mentioned to me in the neighbourhood of Padiham, where estates have not been able to pay the amount of the poor rates, and have been thrown up; but I do not consider that to be a general case, by any means.

1966. Do you mean, that in point of fact you have known instances where the amount of the poor rates levied has been actually more than the rack-rent of the property?—I have heard it reported, but I have not known it of my own actual knowledge; it has been reported to me in speaking of the distresses of the country.

1967. Have you any means of knowing what the quantity of cotton goods produced in your neighbourhood is now, as compared with 1814?—I could have

*Mr.
R. W. Eaton.*

*27 March,
1827.*

*William Fielden,
Esq.*

*29 March,
1827.*

William Fielden,
Esq.

29 March,
1857.

brought a very circumstantial account had I been aware of being called upon; but only knowing it last night, I can only speak from the recollection I have, and what I have heard upon the subject. In the year 1814, there were not as many goods made in the town and neighbourhood of Blackburn, by about 10,000 pieces per week, as there are at the present moment; and the wages may amount now to about 10,000 *l.* less than they did at that period.

1968. What are the principal causes which, in your mind, have led to this very low state of trade at present?—There must have been a great combination of causes, and it is very difficult to account for what it may arise from; there is a great competition now in various quarters, of course, that we never experienced in the time of war; America has become a considerable manufacturing country.

1969. Do you attribute much of the temporary distress to the introduction of power-looms?—It certainly must have interfered to a certain degree, because there have been more goods produced by the hand-loom and the power-loom working together; but the introduction of the power-loom, I conceive, will be a cause of saving the manufactures to this kingdom; without the power-looms the manufactures must be annihilated entirely, for the Americans are making use of the power-loom.

1970. In your mind, is there any probability that the power-loom manufactures, or any other source whatever, will absorb the population who are now thrown out of employ by the discontinuance of the hand loom?—No, by no means.

1971. Do you therefore contemplate that this redundant population will be left without hope of remedy, as a constant and increasing burthen upon your parishes?—I see no prospect whatever of relief being afforded to them; it appears to me to be a permanent evil, I do not see how it is to be got over.

1972. What have been the effects produced by the temporary relief which has been afforded from charitable subscriptions?—It has certainly kept the people from starving, with the little remuneration they have been able to get from weaving; but it may have had a bad consequence in another respect, for it has produced a greater abundance of manufactured goods, for the manufacturer has been enabled in part to pay his wages by the relief that has been afforded by the Relief Committee to the poor weavers; for instance, he could get his work done so much more reasonably, than if they had been paid entirely by the master manufacturer.

1973. The manufacturers were not the organs by which the Relief Committee dealt out their assistance?—No, they were not; there were committees appointed.

1974. You mean, therefore, that the relief afforded had the effect of reducing the price, or keeping down the price of manufacturing labour?—It has produced a superabundance of manufactured goods, by enabling the people to be employed who could not have been employed by the master manufacturers, unless the weavers had been enabled to weave upon such low terms and low wages as the master manufacturers gave them; and, therefore, the relief they have received from the Relief Committee, has enabled the poor weavers to exist, and to work on lower terms than would otherwise have been the case without such assistance.

1975. Would not the effect have been the same, as to their employment, if they had not received that relief?—They must have starved.

1976. Would not they have worked even for two or three shillings a week, rather than have starved?—The master manufacturers are now of a class that are not very affluent, and their capitals have been very much diminished by the distresses of the times; and therefore they could not have afforded to carry on much business from their own capitals.

1977. Are you at all acquainted with Pendle Forest and Padilham?—I am.

1978. Have you not heard that no poor rates whatever have been levied in some townships or parishes in that district?—I am not an particularly well acquainted as to speak to those points; I live at about the distance of twelve miles from thence, and I hear those things from report more than from any personal knowledge I have of the district.

1979. Have you not heard that reported?—I have not.

1980. Not during the time that the penalty rate was collected, namely, that rate collected to make good the losses of the power-loom weavers?—No, I have not heard any particulars from that district.

1981. Had it not been for that local relief to which you have alluded, the master manufacturers, you say, could not have employed or kept the people from starving;

starving; that the wages they gave made up, together with the relief, a subsistence to the people?—Yes.

1982. They paid one and two shillings for labour, for which they must otherwise have paid three or four shillings, to have had the work done?—Yes.

1983. Your opinion therefore, in general, of the effect produced by local relief is, that though those contributions have been necessary for preserving the people from actual starvation, they have had in some respect a mischievous effect, in encouraging over-production of manufactured goods?—Clearly so; for any thing that produces an over-abundance of goods now, is destructive of prices, reduces the prices, and runs down the wages.

1984. Have the overseers of the parishes, in the assistance and relief afforded to the poor, contributed themselves to increase this evil?—Yes, generally I conceive they have, for they have been under the necessity of employing the poor in the workhouses in manufacturing; they would have had a dead weight to support if they had not found them some sort of labour; the only labour they could give them was by looms and work, and that has contributed to the making of more cloth than would otherwise have been made.

1985. Have you turned your thoughts in any way to the subject of affording relief to this superabundant population, by means of emigration?—No, I have not; I left Lancashire six or seven weeks ago, it was not then talked of in Lancashire, and I have merely seen the discussions of Parliament in the newspapers, since I have been in town.

1986. Do you consider that the present population is redundant, that it is a permanent tax upon the poor rates, a tax which must be rather expected to increase than to diminish?—Clearly so.

1987. Do you see any means, under the present circumstances, of diminishing or reducing that burthen?—None whatever, not the least.

1988. Do you remember what occurred in Lancashire, when spinning factories were first established?—I recollect that period very well.

1989. Were not a very considerable number of persons thrown out of work, and was not there great distress in consequence of the introduction of machinery when spinning was introduced by machinery and not by hand labour?—Yes, there was a great deal of distress, and much rioting took place at the time.

1990. Persons who had formerly obtained a good living by spinning by hand labour, were unable to obtain the same wages and in the same manner, in consequence of the introduction of spinning machinery?—If the description of spinning that was carried on in the neighbourhood of Blackburn is alluded to, that which was done by the hand, the raw cotton was taken out by the weaver, and spun in his own house, and the change was productive of considerable inconvenience in the first instance; great alarm was created, and some spinning mills were destroyed at the time; many persons were thrown out of employment; but at that time the manufacture of the kingdom was in a very limited state, compared with what it is at present.

1991. Was not the result of the introduction of that machinery an immense increase of the manufacture?—Very great.

1992. And more advantageous wages for a considerably increased number?—Yes, materially so.

1993. You have stated, that at Blackburn the manufacture has extended at the rate of 10,000 pieces a week beyond what it was formerly, when hand loom weaving was solely employed, and that the wages are now 10,000*l.* a week less than at that time?—Yes.

1994. Do not you conceive that ultimately the effect of the present decrease in the cost of production must be an extension of the demand, that persons who do not now use cotton goods in consequence of not being able to afford the use of them, will, in consequence of the very low price of them, use them?—It will very greatly tend to increase the consumption, but it must be recollected, that we have now rivals whom we had not before, who are manufacturing as cheaply as we can do.

1995. Though we have those rivals, they are obliged to maintain their rivalry by heavy duties on the importation of the commodities from England?—We are paying much heavier duties in England. I allude particularly to America, where they are manufacturing the cotton grown at their own doors, without any expense upon it, and we have a duty to pay on the introduction of it into this country.

William Fielden,
Esq.

29 March,
1847.

1996. The question alludes to the duties on the introduction of manufactured goods from this country into other countries; was not the ability that exists of the rivalry of the nations on the continent, and of America, produced by the imposition of heavy duties on British commodities?—Yes, certainly.

1997. The manufactures in the neighbourhood of Blackburn consist principally of calicoes?—Yes, principally, and hand-loom weaving principally; very little power-loom.

1998. Has there not been a considerable extension of the printed trade?—I do not know to what extent; the duties will show that more exactly than I could state it.

1999. Do not you suppose that a material increase of trade, from what you have heard and experienced, is likely to take place to the East Indies?—Yes, I think that very probable, and that is probably the only quarter from which we can look for consolation.

2000. And also from Canada and New South Wales?—That must be very moderate and progressive, I should conceive, for some time.

2001. Do not you think there will be a new demand in an empire like Russia?—If they do not lay on heavy restrictions.

2002. Upon the whole, you are rather desponding?—Yes, the prospects are, I conceive, very unfavourable.

2003. Are you at all acquainted with any part of the county of Lancashire, particularly the hundred of Blackburn, where the lower class of farmers have been reduced to actual poverty by the poor rates?—I know of no district suffering half so much as the districts of the two Blackburn hundreds, the higher and the lower.

2004. Were you in the country at the period when the rate to remunerate the power-loom owners was levied?—I was.

2005. Was not that levy attended with circumstances of the most dreadful distress?—So much so, that I can mention that in private families where sums of money from the Relief Committee were sent to individuals to have distributed amongst the poor people; the overseers came, and to my family in particular, to request that the distribution of clothes should not be given until the poor people had paid their quotas for the destruction of the power-loom, otherwise their new clothing would be sold up with the rest of their furniture and apparel.

2006. Are you not of opinion that without the measures that were taken to assist the population in the hundred of Blackburn, particularly Pendle Forest and Padiham, and some of the neighbouring townships, that rate could not have been levied at all?—It could not.

2007. Is that in fact levied at this moment?—I do not suppose it is or can be collected, from the very distressed part of the population; those in more affluent circumstances have paid, but there must be a great many arrears.

2008. Are you not distinctly of opinion that in some parts of the county of Lancaster, if the relief which has been afforded had been withheld, the poor rates could not have supplied the deficiency?—Most certainly.

2009. You have stated, that you see no prospect of the present manufacturers in the district of Blackburn being enabled to employ the hand-loom weavers who are thrown out of employment?—I have.

2010. During late years, has the demand for labour in that neighbourhood attracted persons from distant quarters, seeking employment?—None whatever.

2011. Have no Irish come to that neighbourhood?—No, we have very few Irish.

2012. Then during the last six or eight years, you know of no accession of numbers from other parishes?—Not for a length of time, for the purpose of hand-loom weavers; we have very few Irish amongst us; the population has increased, and a number of strangers must have come to the town, for the spinning trade has been increased considerably in Blackburn within the last two or three years, and that has increased the population considerably.

2013. If strangers had not come in, and the unemployed hand-loom weavers had obtained employment from the power-loom manufacturers, would not that have absorbed the population existing in that immediate neighbourhood; would not the power-loom manufacturers have been enabled to employ the hand-loom weavers?—The power-loom weaving is upon much too diminutive a scale to have effected that purpose.

29 March,
1827.

2014. You have already stated the very low wages given to the hand-loom weavers, are you acquainted with the average wages given to the power-loom weavers?—Yes.

2015. What, generally speaking, are their wages?—According to the different qualities made near to or in Blackburn, from thirteen to fourteen pence per piece; but then there are great expenses incurred in the power-loom manufactory that are not borne by the hand-loom weavers, which greatly enhances the cost.

2016. They are borne by the manufacturer himself, the owner of the factory?—Yes.

2017. What do you suppose are the clear wages which the power-loom weavers may now obtain, beginning with the younger and gradually advancing to the oldest and most skilful?—I should suppose the women and children will be gaining from seven to eight shillings a week; there are not many men employed, except the overlookers; but I am speaking of the operatives.

2018. You speak of plain work?—Yes.

2019. Are there no persons employed on the power-looms who get more than seven or eight shillings a week?—Not in the vicinity of Blackburn; but there are some branches of manufactory near Manchester, which are of a much finer description; those I speak of are for the coarser descriptions.

2020. Are you aware that in Manchester there are persons employed in weaving the finer branches, who get from ten to twenty shillings a week?—I know they have in their weaving, in the neighbourhood of Manchester, much more arduous work, both wider and finer fabrics, and where they have greater earnings, of course.

2021. Do you not consider that the wages of the power-loom weaver are reduced to the lowest possible rate that is compatible with his bare subsistence, in consequence of the redundancy of labour among the hand-loom weavers?—Yes, certainly.

2022. Do you not know that the power-loom weavers have been in great distress?—Yes, in very great distress.

2023. Have there been lately any particular circumstances which have entailed great expenses upon the parishes near Blackburn?—Yes, there have been two very important circumstances, which have thrown a very great *onus* upon the land; one has been, a parish church which has been built, and which has cost a very large sum of money, from thirty to forty thousand pounds; the other is, the penalty, (about one thousand eight hundred pounds from the town of Blackburn alone) that has been to be collected, for the breaking of the power-looms, which has come at a most unfortunate period, when all these poor people have been exhausted in their means, and not able to cope with it.

2024. Are the rates altogether levied upon the occupiers or upon the owners?—Upon the occupiers.

2025. The penalty which has been levied for the breaking of these power-looms is levied generally on the hundred?—Generally on the houses and cottages, and property of every description in the hundred.

2026. The 1,800*l.* rate, for the restoration of the machinery destroyed, has been levied upon the hundred generally, has it not?—Not generally; the 1,800*l.* is the quota charged on the town of Blackburn. From what mischief has been done in the hundred of Blackburn, the remuneration has been collected from that hundred; the adjoining hundreds pay only for the injury done within their own districts.

2027. Have any of the parishes raised any money under Mr. Sturges Bourne's Act?—Yes; to rebuild a poor-house in the parish of Levensley, the overseers have borrowed a few hundreds.

2028. Your county is divided into townships?—Yes.

2029. And the poor's rate is levied on the township?—Yes.

2030. Do you know the rental of the township in which you live?—No, I do not.

2031. Do you know the amount of the poor rates levied in that township?—No, I do not.

2032. Do you know how much in the pound is levied on the township for the poor's rates?—No.

2033. Do you know whether the township is rated at rack-rent, or at two thirds, or at what proportion?—At rack-rent, I have always understood.

237.

Z 2

2034. Does

William Fettes,
Esq.
29 March,
1817.

2034. Does the disposition to destroy the power-looms continue?—No, I think that feeling has quite died away; I think the weavers are very sensible of their error. In the Darwen district, they have been actually supplicating that the power-looms may be brought in, to give them employment, the very people who broke them before.

2035. You are not enabled to inform the Committee of any course which presents itself for relieving the weavers of Blackburn from the incumbrance of this superabundant population?—No; if commerce should receive a great stimulus, that would be the best relief which could be afforded to the operative weavers.

2036. Of that you have no expectation?—No, I see no prospect of any thing immediate.

2037. Do you not conceive that the distress of the operatives in the parish of Blackburn arises from their receiving so small a remuneration for their labour?—Decidedly so.

2038. Do you not conceive that arises from the supply of labour being greatly in abundance, as compared with the demand?—Yes, certainly.

2039. Do you not conceive that the introduction of power-loom machinery, necessarily displacing human labour, has tended to aggravate that effect?—It must have done that, to a certain degree; there must have been an increased quantity of goods manufactured by the power-loom and hand-loom weaving together.

2040. Are you not, therefore, satisfied that only one of two alternatives can be expected to happen, to relieve the parish: the revival of commerce, under which the master manufacturers can afford to give greater wages to the labourers, or the removal of some of the labourers, in consequence of which the condition of the remainder might be bettered?—Yes, I think so.

2041. If, therefore, emigration could be expected to be carried into effect satisfactorily to the parties emigrating, and securing their future prosperity, and they were consentient to such a proposal, are you not of opinion that, under the circumstances you have described, of the little hopes among the master manufacturers of revival of trade to any such extent as to restore the proportions between supply and labour, the rate-payers would contribute towards the expenses of emigration, provided they found it was not too great a tax upon them?—I cannot at all tell how far the rate payers might be disposed to raise funds to promote emigration, because the whole community is impoverished, and has suffered so severely from charitable contributions and aids in one way or another, receiving diminished or no rents, that they are unable to afford that relief that they would otherwise have done under more favourable circumstances.

2042. Can you inform the Committee what the expense of maintaining throughout the year, a pauper and his wife and three children, would be in Blackburn?—No, I cannot; I have not been on any select vestry, so as to know the details of those matters; I should state that the expense of maintaining the poor has been much more moderate, from the circumstance of the overseer finding them employment in weaving; they have paid for their sustenance, in a great measure, by their own labour.

2043. Notwithstanding that resource of finding employment for the poor by the overseer, is it not a fact that the rates of Blackburn are burthened to the greatest extent in the maintenance of them?—Yes, certainly; for, with every aid and every assistance, the rates are exceedingly heavy, and unless the charitable contributions which have been given are continued, I see no possibility of the poor existing.

2044. Have you any means of knowing, either from your own observation or from the information of others, whether the stocks of manufactured goods, of different descriptions, in the hands of the purchasers in England and on the continent, are large or small?—I should think small now, for there has been such a length of time for stocks abroad to have got exhausted, that I think they must have diminished and got very low.

2045. After the extraordinary commercial difficulties which have taken place, and the extraordinary depression of all sorts of commodities, do not you think that before we can expect a revival of demand, the persons from whom that demand is to arise must feel the pressure of a want of goods?—Yes, I should think so.

2046. And that in ordinary circumstances they would order goods, and a quantity of goods much greater than under their present local circumstances they would be inclined to do?—Yes.

2047. Has

29 March,
1827.

2047. Has not a mistake pretty generally been made on the subject of the price at which cotton can be produced, both by the manufacturers of cotton and the purchasers of cotton goods?—I think the general observation of the purchasers is, not that they have thought the prices of cotton too high, but that they have no confidence in those prices being maintained; whether those prices will be still further depressed we do not know, so many causes contribute to the depression of the prices of cotton goods, the distress of manufacturers, and a variety of causes.

2048. Has not that mistake made the purchasers of cotton goods still more fearful of laying in stocks than they would otherwise have been?—I do not know whether that is a mistake, we do not know at what price cotton can be produced.

2049. Would not the manufacturing of goods which is now going on in that district, and has been going on for some time, be sufficient for the employment of the people there, if it were not for the introduction of the power-loom?—I ought to explain that by saying, that the manufacture by the power-loom is a very distinct one from that which is carried on by hand-loom, and one that is quite essential to the consumption of the country and to the demand which comes from abroad; I am afraid, from the inquiries which have been made, that there is a sort of invidious distinction drawn between the hand loom and the power-loom, or that which might appear so, by its being admitted that power-loom weaving has contributed to the evil, which it certainly has done, for there have been many more goods made by having the two instruments at work at the same time, both the power-loom and the hand-loom; but the power-loom is so essential to the use of the country, that it will in time explode the hand loom almost entirely I apprehend.

2050. You consider the distress at present existing to arise not from any deficient amount of trade for the employment of the people, but that that trade can now be carried on by a smaller number of hands?—I consider that there is a considerable deficiency in the demand at this time, that it is what is generally termed a very unhealthy state of trade, there is no good demand existing.

2051. You state that they have manufactured more goods lately than on the average of former times!—Yes, they have.

2052. If those goods had been manufactured in the old way, without the power-loom, would not that state of trade have given employment to the people!—Most likely it would, for there must have been a considerable addition made to the quantity manufactured by the power-looms, and if those were abstracted, those which had been made by the hand loom might have been sufficient for the demand.

2053. You have stated that the landowners and persons of property in the district have not turned their attention much to Emigration as a means of relief!—No, it has never been contemplated.

2054. Has it been contemplated by the men in distress?—No, I think not in the least.

2055. You have no Emigration societies?—No, I believe not. I have been absent for the last six or seven weeks.

2056. Do you think the labouring classes would be favourable to any plan of Emigration!—That is a circumstance I cannot speak to at all, because it is quite novel.

2057. You will not understand any question that may have been put to you by this Committee as in the slightest degree expressing an idea prejudicial to the power-loom, but to ascertain the effect of the power-loom on that part of the population which depended upon the hand loom for their subsistence?—I was only afraid that if those questions went into Lancashire, it might appear as if the two were put into competition.

2058. It is perfectly well known to the Committee, that if the power-loom were not employed in Lancashire, it would be employed somewhere else, in consequence of which the labouring poor would be prejudiced instead of benefited!—Certainly.

2059. Did you ever calculate the quantity of manual labour that is dispensed with by the power-loom; how many hands would be required to do the work which a power-loom effects?—I am not able to answer that question with certainty, but I have always understood that about one-third or one-fourth of labour is saved; there are a great number of people employed about the power-looms in various preparations of the article before it comes into the loom, and so many mechanics are employed in making the machinery and keeping it in order, that I do not imagine, from what I have understood, that more than from one-third to one-fourth is saved by the use of power looms.

William Fildes,
Esq.

29 March,
1837.

2060. Do you think that where there were 100 persons employed before the power-loom was effected, it may be assumed that seventy-five are now employed?—Yes, I think so.

2061. But some of the goods are of a different description?—Yes, certainly.

2062. You include all the mechanics engaged in making the power-loom, preparatory to the use of it?—Yes, a great deal of preparation for the work is necessary: it goes through a great many stages to prepare it for the loom.

2063. Do you think that of the persons engaged in the manufacture of cotton, fifty persons are employed now in proportion to a hundred that were employed formerly?—The power-loom is introduced in so small a degree into my district, that I cannot speak to that.

2064. The general impression in your neighbourhood is, that it displaces about one-third of the number formerly employed?—Yes, one-third or one-fourth.

2065. Are you of opinion that if the hand-loom weavers were removed, power-loom would increase in that neighbourhood?—Yes.

2066. Do you not suppose that the mistake admitted to have been generally made as to the cost of the production of cotton, and the fear that the price may be further depressed, have operated so as to increase the disinclination of purchasers of cotton goods to lay in their usual stocks?—I conceive that the purchasers of cotton goods are deterred from purchasing, from a fear of its coming lower; without calculating what the expense of the cost, or the growth is, as I mentioned before, so many circumstances, such as those of scarcity of money, and distress arising from a variety of causes, bring down the prices, that the cost of production can never be calculated upon with certainty.

2067. How long is a man making one piece of calico by a hand loom?—If the slightest description is spoken of, a man will weave about four or five pieces a week, but he must work very hard, and work over hours.

2068. What does a power-loom weave in the same period, of the same article?—No comparison can be drawn, unless the fabrics were the same; a power-loom cannot compete with the hand loom in goods of a thin description; whenever the wages descend for manual labour to about half a crown a piece, the hand loom must be employed; they pay but fifteen pence a piece for the weaving of this cloth by manual labour, and therefore no cloth of that description is manufactured by the power-loom; they make a more substantial article in the power-loom.

2069. Are the power-loom all of the same size?—No, they vary very much, according to the width of the piece they are to produce; different widths are required for different purposes.

2070. Do they, the looms, vary in price very much?—No, the simple loom is worth about 10*l.* to ten guineas.

2071. Do not the power-loom produce a better article, of more uniform quality?—Decidedly so, of a very superior fabric indeed.

William Hulton, Esq. called in; and Examined.

William Hulton,
Esq.

2072. YOU reside in the immediate neighbourhood of Bolton?—I do; I reside twelve miles west of Manchester, four south of Bolton, and about ten from Chorley, in the very heart of the manufacturing districts.

2073. You have been lately in active correspondence with the London relief Committee?—I have, from the first moment of its commencement to the present time.

2074. In the course of your correspondence with them, have you had frequent opportunities of making yourself acquainted with the state of things in your neighbourhood?—Certainly; I have been regularly visiting, not leaving it to committees; but I have myself visited all the cottages within a large district around my own house.

2075. Can you give the Committee any idea of the extent to which distress prevails among the lower and madding classes in that district?—I have lived at Hulton ever since I came of age, and during that time I have never witnessed any thing at all equal to the present distress, by present, I mean the distress of last week, because I do think that it is increasing. I believe there is scarcely one loom in my own immediate neighbourhood unemployed now, but the state of the families of the poor is certainly much more destitute than it was when the Committee first extended the aid of its charitable fund, and when a very great number were unemployed; the present distress arises from several causes; the bedding and clothes

29 March,
1847.

clothes of the poor are totally exhausted. I should mention that I live in the parish of Dean, which consists of ten townships, which are for all purposes as distinct as if they were separate parishes, and in these several townships the employment of labour is quite different; for instance, in the township in which I live it has been my object always to reduce the number of cottages, whenever they were vacant I have pulled them down; besides, the coal trade is the chief branch in which the people are employed, consequently in my own township we feel little or no distress. Over the hedge, which bounds my township from the township of West Houghton on the west side, and the township of Atherton on the south, they are almost wholly employed in hand-loom weaving, and it is almost incredible to see the different state of comfort in the one township and of misery in the other; the poor rates in West Houghton have increased, and are on the increase; I think that as compared with last year they will be found to be tripled or quadrupled. If I had expected to have been examined, I would have brought some details on this subject. The misery is beginning to work now by the poverty of the small lay payers, for, as has been mentioned by another witness, our farms are generally very small, they may keep two or three cows, there are exceptions, but they are generally small, and those lay payers, whose families were employed in the hand-loom weaving, have left their land in a very bad state, they have generally attended to their looms; now they cannot obtain sufficient to pay their taxes; the consequence is, that the persons to whom their land belongs must suffer; among that class the distress has been so great that it became a serious question with us on the last grant from the Committee in London, whether we should rigidly adhere to the rule we had laid down, not to relieve those who were lay payers, because it appeared to involve a contradiction that we should relieve those that were compelled to pay to the town. Within the last month we have found some such extreme cases of distress, that we have been obliged, in as delicate a manner as we could, for their feelings were almost hurt by receiving the relief, to give it in the way of bedding and clothes; it has been the most painful duty any person can be engaged in; we have had to relieve those who have seen much better days.

2076. With a view of giving the Committee a general idea of the extent of the distress, can you mention any particular instances of which you have been yourself an eye witness?—One or two I have ventured to report to the London Relief Committee, such as I had not conceived to exist in a civilized country; there is one I have not reported, which was anterior to the last donation we received. Mrs. Hulton and myself, in visiting the poor, were asked by a person almost starving, to go into a house, we there found on one side of the fire a very old man, apparently dying, on the other side a young man of about eighteen, with a child on his knee, whose mother had just died and been buried, and evidently both that young man and the child were suffering from want; of course our object was to relieve them, and we were going away from that house, when the woman said, Sir, you have not seen all; we went up stairs, and under some rags we found another young man, the widower, and on turning down the rags, which he was unable to remove himself, we found another man who was dying, and who did die in the course of the day; I have no doubt that family were actually starving at the time.

2077. Though that case may be an extreme one, are there very many families in that neighbourhood who are on the very verge of famine, if not suffering actual famine?—I am sure that both I and the Clergyman of West Houghton, who has been with me latterly, have made a very accurate calculation on that point in the last township we visited, West Houghton, consisting of rather more than five thousand inhabitants; we found two thousand five hundred totally destitute of bedding, and nearly so of clothes; I am positive I am correct, when I say that six per cent are in a state such as that described, a state of famine, or that approaching to it; it is from the papers I have prepared for the Committee, that I deduce that to be an accurate statement. In another case of extreme distress, there were a widow and three children who had not tasted the meal and water, which is the only thing almost they eat there, for eight and forty hours; I found a young man of sixteen in such a state of exhaustion, I was obliged to send a cart with a litter to bring him home, and he is now under my own care, and we have hardly been able to sustain him in life; we found many families who have not made one meal in twenty-four hours. It appears very strange that, with resident magistrates and overseers, such cases of distress could occur; it is only where

William Walton,
Esq.

29 March,
1827.

there are hand-loom weavers, and in remote situations; these do not occur in towns, but in country districts, where the hand-loom weavers are thickly spread; the masses of people assembled together tend to create distress, for they are not the persons who belong to the identical township in which they live, but many of them having settled from remote distances, find a great difficulty in getting relief from their townships, for their settlements are disputed, and there are many ways in which they are prevented getting the relief which they need afforded to them.

2078. As you have mentioned the difference of distress in those parishes, inhabited in a great measure by hand-loom weavers and others, can you state the difference in the amount of the poor rates, how much per cent?—Not with sufficient accuracy.

2079. Can you state the amount of the poor rates in your own township?—No, I cannot.

2080. How is the poor rate paid in your district?—By a rate of the inhabitants upon themselves; the rate payers meet, and ascertain what will be necessary for the relief of the poor, and the county rates; having ascertained that, the book is laid before two magistrates, for their approbation and signature.

2081. Are your overseers over townships in the same manner as over parishes?—Yes.

2082. Have you ever made any calculation, or can you at all give the Committee an idea, of what is the amount necessary to support a family in a state wholly destitute, for a twelvemonth, taking the average to consist of five persons?—Yes, I would state what guides myself and my brother magistrates, when we are applied to for relief; we used to consider it right that the allowance per head should amount to three shillings a week, that they should make up for their maintenance fifteen shillings, and whatever was wanting to make up that we ordered the overseers to make up; we consider that now too high to be levied, and we think they ought to have 2s. 6d. per head, to maintain them in clothes and food; that would be about 30*l.* per annum to maintain a family of five persons; in the money granted to the mother of illegitimate children, we always grant in common cases 1s. 6d. a week.

2083. Do you think there are many persons at present in your district, who are in this state of entire destitution and entire dependence on parish relief?—No, I think there are very few who are entirely so, because all the looms are in employment. I take the average wages which a really good weaver at a hand loom will obtain, to be about 8*s.* a week, but from that there are drawbacks, which I do not understand, not being conversant with trade; the average of women, and children of fifteen or sixteen years old, I take to be about 3*s.* per week. But on this part of the subject I am bound to state one great grievance to which they are subject, the trade has been subdivided into the hands of master manufacturers, who are men of no education, and little capital, the consequence is, that even this money which I state as the average, is paid in what is termed shop stuff; I look upon that to be one of the greatest evils which exists in our country.

2084. That is illegal?—Perfectly so; and we are most anxious, as magistrates, to convict where we can; but such is the terror of the people in coming forward, that we cannot get at the proof of it. A custom prevails now very generally, of the little master manufacturers building cottages appropriated to their weavers, and those weavers who are permitted to live in them, pay a much higher rent than they would to me, or any other country gentleman; so that there is a great diminution of that which appears as the payment for labour.

2085. Do you think an advantage will result from the introduction generally of power-loom, that that will throw the cotton trade into the hands of persons possessing larger capital, and therefore of more liberal habits and feelings?—Yes, decidedly; it must require a given capital to erect a power-loom manufactory of any size; but I should say, as far as my belief goes, there again those so employed in the steam manufactures are obliged to purchase at a certain shop, and to live in a certain house; that prevails, I believe, in the towns generally, I know it does in Bolton.

2086. Is it your opinion that, according to the present state of the trade, the population in your district is beyond all dispute redundant?—Yes, certainly, it is impossible to find employment for them.

2087. Is there any immediate probability, as far as you can judge, of such a change in the proportion between labour and the demand for it, as shall make that population no longer redundant?—I am perfectly unacquainted with trade,
and

and the probability of demand, but taking it that the demand does not increase, but remains as at present, it is not possible they can be employed.

2088. Do you conceive that a great proportion of the people are now permanently and hopelessly a burthen on the poor rates?—Unquestionably; and I consider, in my own neighbourhood, every yard of calico or muslin manufactured has a great portion of the cost paid out of the township rates from our lands, because these materials are manufactured at a price which will not keep the labourers who make them, and therefore what is wanted in the wages of the master manufacturer to support life, comes from the poor rates.

2089. Have you considered what would be likely to be the effect of emigration, in relieving from the effects of this superabundant population?—Only within these few days.

2090. Would it, in your opinion, be advisable for parishes and townships situate as those you have described, to get rid of a certain proportion of the population, supposing them to be charged with a sum equal to two or three years purchase of the poor rates laid out upon that family?—Speaking as a landed proprietor, I should be very happy to see such a measure carried into effect; and I have no doubt that, by proper explanation to the people themselves, they would be willing to avail themselves of it.

2091. Do you think that if such explanation were given, and it was satisfactorily proved that emigrants might be placed in a comfortable situation, and the parish freed from the burthen of maintaining them, at an expense of two years purchase of those persons maintenance, funds would be raised from charitable and voluntary contributions in aid of such a project, and in assistance of the poor rates?—No, I am quite certain it is quite in vain to look for aid from voluntary contributions, for the demand has been such on those who have had the means and disposition to give, they have not any longer the means of giving.

2092. You consider that the parish would gain in many instances by laying out a sum equal to two years expenses?—Certainly, I think they would avail themselves of it.

2093. You have stated, that in the case of a weaver's family, consisting of a man, a woman, and three children on an average, who are supposed to be wholly destitute of employment, the parish expense, during the whole year, amounted to about 30*l.*?—Yes.

2094. Do you think that in the present state of your townships, there would be a disposition, if power was given by law so to do, to charge the poor rates for ten years with an annuity of 7*l.* 10*s.* per annum, which would raise, at 5 per cent, a sum of 60*l.* for the purpose of getting rid of each of those families, the difference being in the first year between 7*l.* 10*s.* and 30*l.* being 22*l.* 10*s.*?—That proportion would hold good, if the family were wholly maintained from the township; but it is only a portion of it that comes from parochial relief. I am satisfied that the townships would gain by an abstraction of manual labour; at present, the people are in so reduced a situation of life, that they have no means of bringing up their children to any trade but that of weaving, and therefore as long as the population remains as great as it is, they are bringing up a new race of weavers. They have no means of giving them the slightest education, except what we do by charitable means; and the various employments of labour, other than by hand-loom weaving, are all full to repletion.

2095. What is the description of the population in your part of Lancashire; are they natives of Lancashire, or are a great proportion of them strangers?—There are a great proportion of strangers; and one of the evils to which I have alluded, where I have found so much distress, has been frequently from the distance from the place of settlement in which the pauper has resided.

2096. Are there a great many Irish who have lately settled in that district?—No, I should say not lately; and in the townships which are not immediately in the situation of towns, there are not many Irish spend over the district; I live in a manufacturing district which is almost one town, each lane has its population of hand-loom weavers; but the Irish concentrate themselves in the manufacturing towns, and not the manufacturing districts.

2097. Do you think the population of that district is going on increasing, notwithstanding the severity of the distress; do you think that the severity of the distress has had any tendency to check marriages?—I believe not to any great extent;

have made that inquiry at my own parish church, but not at any other; I know,

William Hutton,
Esq.

29 March,
1847.

as a magistrate, we have quite as many illegitimate children brought before us at any period however prosperous.

2098. How do you deal with the case of an illegitimate child, do you throw the burthen upon the parent?—They are totally unable, in many instances, to support them; the townships have taken very strong measures of late to enforce it; the measures taken by the overseers to enforce the payment for illegitimate children have produced the very worst consequences; in many instances the fathers have been committed to our prisons, which are quite full; the prison of our hundred now contains 740 inmates; the mothers are unable to maintain these illegitimate children, and there has been an additional burthen on the poor rates from that cause.

2099. Supposing in any particular township there should be a partial revival of trade, do you think that any measures might be taken to prevent a sudden increase of population, from the small manufacturer building small cottages for the purpose of their being inhabited by his workmen?—That is a question on which I have thought only for the last four and twenty hours, and I am not able to give a direct answer to it; when I stated the good effects to result from the removal of a part of our population, another consideration was, how we should prevent their cottages being occupied by others; but without a very distinct revival is felt, I think that it is no longer a good speculation to engage in building them, the persons who have built them, and the friendly societies who have engaged in the building of them, have not found it a profitable use of their money.

2100. It has not been the practice in your part of the country to pay rents from the poor rates?—No.

2101. Consequently a person has not the same interest in the building cottages as he might if the rent was paid out of the rates?—No, certainly not; I know one or two townships where one or two of the principal rate payers are proprietors of cottages, and they will of course, under those circumstances, take care to secure their rents for those cottages in an underhand way, perhaps from the overseer; but those are peculiar circumstances, and where it prevails, in nine cases out of ten, we positively refuse, if it is brought before us as magistrates, to give any thing in the way of rent; there will not, in my opinion, be any disposition to build.

2102. Has there been any sort of jealousy, in the township of which you speak, of persons coming in and acquiring a settlement?—Yes, there has been great caution to prevent new settlements being gained.

2103. Has the caution grown up of late in consequence of the severe pressure which has been felt from too abundant a population?—I am not aware how long that jealousy has existed in townships in which I have no property of my own, but where I can speak with more certainty it has been an object with us to prevent new settlers. A gentleman has lately offered to lay out 30,000*l.* on an estate of mine, and I have declined it, to prevent settlements.

2104. Is it possible for a poor person coming into a parish and occupying one of those cottages, to obtain a settlement?—There have been a great many settlements improperly gained in this way; a person having property in one township and also in an adjoining one, will frequently give such an interest and put a man into such a situation in that parish where he has little property, as to relieve the other parish where he has a greater one.

2105. Is it possible, since Mr. Sturges Bourne's Act, to obtain a settlement in that way?—No, the tenement must be in the same parish; he cannot do it by cottages, unless they let for 10*l.* a year.

2106. Have you any apprehension that in case of those cottages being vacant, in consequence of the abstraction of the poor, it would be to the interest of any parties to introduce single men into them, hiring the service of those single men for a year, for the purpose of establishing those individuals as parishioners, and consequently enabling them to occupy those tenements afterwards as married persons?—I have no apprehension whatever of that, certainly.

2107. Are master manufacturers in your townships in the habit of taking apprentices?—I believe they would not call themselves master manufacturers; but it is a common thing for a weaver who has considerable premises, to take apprentices into his house.

2108. Are the weavers carrying on manufactories in your neighbourhood, much in the habit of taking apprentices?—Yes, they are.

2109. Has

William Hallon,
Esq.

19 March
1827.

2109. Has that practice of late increased or diminished?—I cannot speak to the absolute fact, but I am sure there is so much vigilance on the part of the overseers, that they prevent the introduction of any strangers into their townships as apprentices.

2110. If any apprentice should be taken by a weaver, and should want parochial relief, would not the overseers object to his receiving any parochial relief during the time of his apprenticeship?—As a magistrate I should feel myself obliged to order relief for the apprentice.

2111. Should you not feel yourself called upon to oblige the master to relieve him?—Not in a case of sickness.

2112. Upon what party does the expense of removal of a pauper who has not a settlement, and has no claim upon parish relief, fall?—The practice is this; a pauper belonging to a distant settlement, but resident in any given township, applies for relief to the overseer of that particular township in which he is resident; he probably, in the first instance, declines relieving him because he belongs to another parish; the pauper then comes before the magistrates, and states his case of distress; if the magistrates consider the application as proper, relief is immediately ordered on the township in which he is resident; the overseer then sets his wits to work, and finds out to what township the person belongs, and the overseer of that parish to which he belongs, repays to the overseer of the parish where he is the expense incurred.

2113. Is there no practical difficulty in obtaining the repayment of the expenses, or is there so much litigation you do not actually enforce the claim?—In a general way the expenses are recovered without much difficulty.

2114. Do you often proceed practically to remove the pauper to the place of his settlement?—Yes.

2115. Upon what township do the expenses of his removal fall?—Upon the township removing.

2116. Do not the claims from persons who have no right to apply to the poor rate, constitute a very heavy burthen upon them in severe cases of distress?—Yes, certainly; there are constant claims, which no person living in that country can refuse.

2117. Are not the claims from persons who have no strict right to apply to the parish for relief, almost as burthensome, in point of appeal to humanity, as the claims of those who have a right?—Quite as much in point of humanity; but in point of law, if the overseers appeal to the decision of the magistrate, he feels compelled to refuse relief, except in a case of sickness or very great distress.

2118. In the case of distribution of charitable funds, is there any distinction taken between those who have legal claims, and those who have not?—Not the slightest in the district in which I have acted, which contains from thirty to forty thousand inhabitants.

2119. Supposing you could remove a portion of those who had a legal settlement in the parish, would not the burthen remain in a great measure unalleviated, unless you could take measures for the removal of that portion who make an appeal to your charity, if they cannot make a legal claim on the poor rates?—The claim on one's charitable feeling would be the same, but the claim on the land would not be the same; for though the person having ability would feel himself strongly urged to give to those having no claim, the farmers would be relieved by an abstraction of the population, and they would not incur any thing material in the shape of poor rates, by those places being filled up by strangers.

2120. In case a small manufacturer should let his cottages for 2*l.* a year to an Irishman when trade was depressed, though that family would not have a claim upon the poor rates, would not the presence of that family, when trade was very much depressed, be a burthen nearly as great as that of persons who were parishioners?—It would be a burthen on our feelings, and on the purse of those who had the means, but not a burthen on the rate payers, as such.

2121. In providing for the morality and general discipline of the parish, would not they constitute almost as great a burthen as the presence of persons having legal settlements?—They would have all the claims to assistance in education, and assistance in sickness from the dispensaries and local charitable institutions, but it would not be thought necessary, nor would it be legal, for the parish officer to relieve them.

2122. Has not an Act recently passed, enabling you to pass to Ireland any Irish pauper who may apply for relief?—I am sorry to say that the expense incurred

William Hall, Esq.

30 March,
1817.

under that Act, prevents its provisions from being carried into effect. The expense incurred by the county of Lancaster last year, for simply removing Irish paupers from Liverpool to Dublin, was 4,000*l*.

2123. That was not an expense borne by any particular parish?—No, a county rate spread over the townships.

2124. Were the cases of extreme distress you have stated to the Committee, cases of persons having a right on the parish, or not having?—Of the cases of very severe distress which I have mentioned, one was living on the township in which he belonged, the other was not.

2125. Could such cases as those you have mentioned, of persons dying for want, have existed in the case of persons having a claim upon that parish; would not the magistrates interfere?—Yes, I am quite sure that the magistrates, the persons in authority, and the more respectable part of the inhabitants, must have been unaware of the extent of distress which prevailed; though in the constant habit of visiting the poor for years, I had no idea of such distress, till I visited under the London Committee.

2126. Do not you therefore consider those extreme cases to have been in a great degree accidental?—I do not think there are many quite parallel cases; but I think the people are every day getting into such a state of additional distress, from the total want of bedding and clothes; the whole township where hand-loom weaving prevails will be soon in the same state of distress. I have pointed out two strong cases, but if I thought that the patience of the Committee would allow it, out of the six in every hundred, I could detail nearly similar circumstances of woe.

2127. Supposing the parishioners were to be removed from the cottages built by Friendly Societies, and they were to be reinhabited by Irish, who might become chargeable upon the parishes if suffered to remain, do you not think that there would be a practice of informing those persons, that if they came there would not be any disposition to relieve them in case of distress?—They would be discouraged in every way.

2128. Do you think that any disposition exists among the masters to keep up an excess of population to enable them to command cheap labour?—I think not, because machinery is superseding the use of manual labour.

2129. Are you quite certain that the weavers in West Houghton are in the habit of taking apprentices?—Yes, certainly.

2130. What is the rate of agricultural wages in your township?—I do not know what the farmers give, but I give 14*s* a week to every one of my men on a large farm; I have not reduced them.

2131. Are there power-loom factories in West Houghton?—No, there are not.

2132. If you had had power-loom manufactories in West Houghton, would they not have contributed in some degree to your relief?—I cannot answer that question.

2133. Do you not think that it would be practicable to make the persons possessing the houses to which those Irish or other strangers might flock, feel more sensibly, in times of adversity, the burthen, either from charity or by levies, of supporting them?—I think that compelling the proprietors of cottage property to pay the rates instead of the occupiers, would have that effect.

2134. Have the overseers of the poor any power whatever to prevent any weaver from taking an apprentice?—They have not.

2135. If the master is unable to maintain his apprentice during the period of his apprenticeship, is not the parish obliged to maintain the apprentice as well as the master?—The parish is.

2136. Does not some part of the expense of removing Irish paupers fall upon the removing parish, beyond that expense which falls upon the county rate?—Certainly.

2137. Is there any other subject upon which you would wish to offer any remarks to the Committee?—I should wish to express my very strong opinion, in contradistinction to that of the last witness, as to the effects of the contributions from the London Relief Committee: Nothing but the donations of that society could have saved us from famine; they have induced the most delightful intercourse between the different ranks of the community; and the practical result has been, that in our populous district not one instance of riot or disturbance has occurred.

Sabbati, 31^a die Martii, 1827.

ALEXANDER BARING, ESQUIRE,

IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. William Sudlow Fitzhugh, called in; and Examined.

2138. WHAT is the nature of your duties at Liverpool, with respect to passengers leaving the kingdom in considerable numbers on board of merchant vessels?—I was appointed by the American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool, in consequence of the frauds and impositions that had been practised upon passengers for some years previous to the appointment; it was in the spring of 1823 when the appointment took place, and my business is to attend principally to steerage passengers going out from that port.

2139. Do you hold a permanent situation there?—I hold the appointment so long as it is considered that I act consistently with the nature of my engagement.

2140. Do you receive a salary?—I receive a commission derived from the money paid by the passengers, it is paid by the shipowners.

2141. What is the amount of it?—It is five per cent commission upon the passage money.

2142. What power have you of enforcing that, is it by any Act of Parliament?—No, it is by contract with the merchants.

2143. Do the shipowners agree that you shall have five per cent upon the passage money?—The shipowners place the vessels in my hand to procure passengers for them; and when the passengers come down, I direct them to proper vessels, for which the shipowners pay me after that rate.

2144. How long have you been so occupied?—Since April 1823.

2145. Are you agent for the ship otherwise, or merely as regards the passengers?—Only as it regards the passengers.

2146. By steerage passengers you mean the poorer class of emigrants?—Yes, I do.

2147. Have you any thing to do with the cabin passengers?—Yes, so far as making arrangements for them, and entering their names upon the muster roll.

2148. Has the number been considerable of those steerage passengers going out in any vessels to America?—Yes, very considerable.

2149. Does it continue to be so at the present time?—Yes, it continues, and seems to be increasing.

2150. To what parts do they principally go?—Principally to the United States of America, chiefly to New York and Philadelphia, and some few to Boston.

2151. Have you any thing to do with those who go to our own colonies in America?—Yes; but there are not many who have gone, in the last two or three years, to the British colonies.

2152. Have you not a good many timber ships arriving from those colonies at Liverpool?—A great many ships go from Liverpool to the ports of New Brunswick and Quebec.

2153. Do they not carry out passengers?—They would do it if passengers applied; but very few passengers go to Quebec from Liverpool.

2154. Do timber ships generally go out with light cargoes from Liverpool?—Many of them only in ballast, and some with only part cargoes.

2155. From your experience, do you think that some legal protection to the poorer class of passengers or emigrants is necessary, or do you think that such poor persons may be safely trusted to make their own engagements with masters of vessels bound to different parts of America, without any restrictions other than the self-interest of each party may naturally produce, without any specific law being made for the purpose?—I think some protection is absolutely necessary.

2156. Have you any facts to show that legislative protection is necessary, and if so, be pleased to state them?—There are some facts stated in the Report of the

Mr.
W. S. Fitzgk.
31 March,
1827.

Mr.
W. S. Fitzgerald

31 March,
1827.

American Chamber of Commerce in Liverpool, printed in the Appendix to the Report of the Committee on Emigration, in page 296.

2157. Have you any others to state?—Cases of fraud and imposition are occurring in Liverpool every week upon the poorer classes of emigrants; and during the last year, a case of very gross imposition occurred, in which the merchants interfered, and prosecuted the parties to conviction for the fraud. I conceive some legal protection is necessary, because it is out of the power of the emigrants, who are generally poor, either to obtain the legal remedy themselves in consequence of their poverty, or to wait to obtain it at the quarter sessions, even if they had money, in consequence of it being necessary to proceed on their voyage. There has also been placed in the hands of Mr. Horton, a letter from Liverpool, stating the fact I have just now mentioned, as to the imposition upon emigrants during the last year.

2158. Those impositions have been constantly practised, have they not?—Yes, constantly, and are now.

2159. Notwithstanding the law as it at present stands?—Yes; I conceive it affords no protection from those kinds of impositions, in consequence of their not having the ability to wait for the quarter sessions, or to proceed to procure redress by law, from their poverty.

2160. So that the regulations by Act of Parliament have been found insufficient to give redress to those emigrants?—I conceive so.

2161. Does that arise from the law being neglected, or not being sufficient?—Perhaps I should be understood better, if I explain the nature of the impositions and frauds practised. The poorer class of emigrants who come down to a sea-port are generally ignorant, they have probably never been in any sea-port before; they do not know the nature of the vessels, or the kind of bargain they ought to make; and unprincipled persons, engaged in trade, and there are many such engaged in that trade, find it their interest to induce those people to entrust their money in their hands under false representations, and instead of paying the owner of the ship for their passage, they send them on board in some instances without having paid the money they have previously received; it was for that they were prosecuted during the last year. Another mode of imposition is, that they frequently obtain their money under the pretence that the ship is going to sea in two or three days, and keep them there three or four weeks, or more, for which they have no redress; if they apply to the magistrates, the magistrates tell them that the parties have broken their contract, and that they must appeal to a jury at the quarter sessions.

2162. Do you think it possible by any legislation to provide for all the mischievous circumstances of oppression or grievance that may arise between the parties?—I think it possible to place within their power legal redress by such an Act as this, by referring all such matters to the decision of the magistrates, who shall have power to summon the parties before them; the same power is given to the magistrates, under similar circumstances, in other Acts of Parliament; I do not think any inconvenience would arise from it.

2163. Have you read over the printed paper, entitled, A Bill to repeal certain parts of what has been called the Passengers Act, and the manuscript draft of another Bill for the same purpose?—I have. May I be allowed to state what I forgot to mention before; there was a case occurred in London similar to what occurred last year in Liverpool, I dare say some evidence may be procured in London respecting it; the passengers were engaged, the charterer, it appeared, had not paid the shipowner, and the parties were without any remedy.

2164. In those cases of fraud, the parties all had their redress at common law, if they had been able to wait and prosecute their case?—Certainly.

2165. Do you think that the last mentioned Bill, in manuscript, if passed into a law, would be sufficient to afford fair and adequate protection to the poorer class of emigrants?—I think not quite.

2166. Will you state the nature of the legal protection which you deem necessary to be afforded to the poorer class of emigrants?—I have read over the manuscript Bill carefully, and if I may be permitted, I will read to the Committee the remarks I put down upon paper while the Bill was in my possession. In the manuscript Bill there appears to be no clause applying to vessels having cargo on board and carrying passengers; after the second clause, the third section of the

6th

Mr.
W. S. Fitzgerald.
31 March,
1827.

6th of George IV. c. 116. might with propriety be inserted; in that section, two tons is defined to be six feet by two feet and a half, and the whole height between decks. In the enumeration of provisions, in the third clause, potatoes ought to be included, as a description of food generally taken by emigrants; two pounds, instead of one pound and a half per day is, in my opinion, the lowest quantity that should be inserted in the Act. The qualifications of the surgeon or medical man, in the fourth clause, seem not to be sufficiently defined; if the qualifications are to be the same as those in the 6th George IV. c. 116. sec. 12. it would be better to copy the phraseology of that Act, if otherwise, to state them with precision. There is no regulation respecting a medicine chest. The 6th clause appears to be ambiguous: if it is intended, that no vessel, although short of her full complement of passengers, shall be allowed to carry any part of her cargo, provisions, &c. between decks, it will be very oppressive in its operation, by preventing many vessels from taking passengers that have excellent accommodations, and the owners of which are willing to take a limited number only; if it is intended to apply to such vessels only as have on board the full complement of one passenger to every two tons, it may easily be evaded, and will always be evaded by taking on board a few less than the full number; the best regulation is that before mentioned, namely, two tons of unoccupied space for each adult passenger. The regulations in the seventh clause, respecting the delivery of the counterpart of the passengers list to the Collectors of His Majesty's Customs abroad, can only apply to British ships; British consuls in Foreign ports might be invested with similar powers. Poor emigrants are subject to many impositions, beside being landed at a port other than agreed upon, against which the 8th clause is intended to afford protection. Persons from the interior of the country seeking passages abroad, are generally entire strangers in the sea-ports; they are deceived by interested and unprincipled persons, who obtain possession of their money by false representations, both as to the destination of the vessels and periods of sailing; in many instances families have been turned out of the vessels by the masters, after having paid their passage to the broker or agent, the latter having engaged a greater number of persons than the vessel was allowed to carry, with a view to his own pecuniary advantage. The Emigrants, being poor, are unable to obtain legal redress; and being anxious to proceed on their voyage, would rather sacrifice the money, than wait the issue of a trial at the Quarter Sessions. It is therefore very desirable to refer all matters of this kind in dispute between the masters of vessels, their brokers or agents, and passengers, to the decision of two Justices, who should be authorized and required to summon the parties on the complaint of either, and to determine the differences between them without appeal. This clause is made to apply only to persons emigrating to His Majesty's possessions abroad; the same frauds might be practised on persons emigrating in British or Foreign vessels to Foreign ports; they require the same protection, which will be effectually given by the penalty of the bond (required by a subsequent clause) being enforced on the surety. The imprisonment of the master for one calendar month, appears too slight a punishment for an offence which under some circumstances may be of great magnitude. As to the 10th clause, it appears to be too short a time to restrict the enforcement of the bond to eight calendar months; the 6th George IV. gives three years. The commencement of the operation of the Act is not fixed; this may cause great inconvenience to parties making arrangements immediately preceding the passing of the Act. There is nothing in this Act to prevent the reloading of water and provisions after the vessel has cleared out. See the 10th sec. of 6th George IV. c. 116; and also the 11th sec. of the same Act, respecting airing the bedding and fumigating the vessel; and the 8th and 9th sections.

2167. Can you give this Committee any information as to the number of passengers who might annually be sent from Liverpool to the British provinces in North America, considering two tons of unoccupied space as being a fair proportion for each adult passenger, on board vessels now actually engaged in trading to those provinces?—There are about 25,000 tons of shipping employed between Liverpool and the port of Quebec, and to the ports of New Brunswick about 35,000 tons; the portion of those vessels unoccupied, would accommodate about 25,000, or from that to 30,000 persons; there arrive at the port of Quebec annually, from 150 to 200,000 tons from Great Britain, a great proportion of which is entirely unoccupied, so that I conceive there is sufficient accommodation for any number of emigrants that it might be thought proper to send out.

Mr.
W. S. Fitzgerald.

31 March,
1857.

2168. With regard to the poorer emigrants that come to Liverpool to go to the colonies, are they in the habit of applying to you to get a passage for them?—Yes.

2169. Do they come to you for advice where they should go to, or have they made up their minds before they come to you?—They have generally made up their minds, but they frequently write to me from the country, knowing there is such an establishment at Liverpool.

2170. Can you give any reason why so few go to our own colonies?—The majority of the emigration to Canada consists of the Irish, and for some years past the vessels have been chartered at Liverpool, and taken over to Ireland for the purpose of taking emigrants on board there, so that we have had fewer at Liverpool than formerly.

2171. Have you read the printed paper, N° 4, containing the answers of the Collectors of the Customs at Londonderry to certain questions relative to the legal protection of the poorer class of emigrants?—I have.

2172. How do you agree with the answers given by Mr. Hill?—Generally, I agree with him.

2173. On what do you not agree with him; is there any material circumstance in which you do not agree with him?—I think, so far as I recollect the paper, chiefly with regard to the number of passengers a vessel might be allowed to take, I think he puts down a greater number than I think would be right.

2174. To what extent have the manufacturing poor emigrated; and are you aware if the disposition to emigrate still exists among them?—During the last two years, the emigration from Liverpool to the United States of America has consisted chiefly of manufacturers from the different parts of Lancashire and Yorkshire, and there still exists among those manufacturers a great disposition to emigrate; there was in Liverpool, when I left there, several vessels filled almost entirely with manufacturers, many of whom had been engaged by parties embarked in manufacturing in the United States, and their passages paid by them; those were chiefly calico printers.

2175. Do the weavers go in any number?—A great many.

2176. But they are principally calico printers?—Yes, those persons who had been engaged by manufacturers in America, and whose passages had been paid.

2177. Are they paid for by American manufacturers?—Yes.

2178. They are going out in considerable numbers?—Yes, in considerable numbers.

2179. What sum of money do they usually have with them upon the average?—In former years, the emigrants had frequently a considerable sum of money with them; I have known parties come down to Liverpool with 1,000*l.* or 1,200*l.*; in 1823, and previous to that, they had large sums of money with them, but in the last two years they have been very poor, and have scarcely had more than sufficient to pay the passage money. With respect to the disposition on the part of the manufacturers to emigrate, I can lay before the Committee some letters I have received from them in the course of my business; I have selected those, [*producing a bundle of letters*]; these are entirely from manufacturers; the first is dated Blackburn, the 19th of March, signed on behalf of 41 persons.

2180. Is that a letter addressed to you?—Yes, addressed to me in the course of my business; it desires me to engage a passage for them.

2181. What answer did you make to that application?—I told them they could have a vessel whenever they came.

2182. At what rate of passage money?—From four pounds ten to five pounds; that does not include provisions.

2183. What additional sum is required to take reasonable provision for their maintenance during the passage?—A passenger from England, who goes out at his own expense, will usually take provisions amounting to from two to three pounds, but he seldom consumes all of it; there are some who have not much money, they will only lay out from twenty to thirty shillings.

2184. Do you think that sufficient for the poorer class of emigrants?—Yes, from 25*s.* to 30*s.* would be sufficient.

2185. What species of provisions would they procure?—Oatmeal, potatoes, molasses and bacon, or meat of some kind or other.

2186. Those people who emigrate are many of them with families, or are they mostly single men?—Many with families, perhaps most of them.

2187. What

2187. What would be the amount of freight for a family consisting of a man, his wife and three children, to any port of the United States?—A man and his wife and three children, in Liverpool at the present time, could obtain a passage in a good ship, to a port in the United States, for from 12*l.* to 14*l.*

2188. Including provisions?—No, not including provisions; the ships that go out to the United States are merchant vessels, carrying cargoes, and have limited accommodation for passengers; but as they are not entirely laid out for it, their rate of passage is higher than if taken up entirely for passengers.

2189. Would not a ship going to Canada take emigrants at a considerably lower rate?—During the course of my business I have engaged passages to Canada as low as 2*l.*

2190. What would be the charge for a passage to New York?—Four pounds, or 4*l.* 10*s.*

2191. They could go for one half the price as respects freight, to the British colonies?—If I am to speak of the expense of taking passengers to the British colonies, it should be with reference to a considerable number at a time, and taking a considerable number in one ship, so as to afford a full cargo; I imagine it would not cost more than from thirty to forty shillings for the passage from Liverpool to Quebec.

2192. How much for provisions?—If the passengers were to find their own provisions, and had to lay in a stock for their own families separately, it would cost from twenty-five to thirty shillings a head for provisions.

2193. Would it be any less for any port of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia?—I should not consider it advisable for them to lay in a less stock of provisions, and the rate of freight would not be different.

2194. Are you speaking of adults, or families with children?—Of adults.

2195. What would be the charge for a family, consisting of a man, his wife and three children, supposing the children to be under ten years of age?—I have spoken of passages where they have been engaged singly, or for families; if it is desirable to ascertain what it would cost to take up a vessel that would accommodate a certain number, I should say that twenty shillings per ton register, or less, so that a calculation will be easily made from that rate.

2196. Do you consider two tons register sufficient for three grown persons?—I think two tons of actual space for one grown person, that being six feet long by two and a half broad.

2197. Do you consider it practicable to induce the manufacturing poor to settle as agriculturists in Canada?—I have in the course of my business conversed with several that have come to Liverpool, and when the matter has been explained to them, they have been desirous to go, and would willingly go there.

2198. Do you find that they have generally a dislike to the employment they have been used to, and prefer agriculture?—Most of the emigrants from the country towns, not the large manufacturing towns, such as Manchester, but from the neighbouring country towns where they have been employed in the hand-loom, are connected with some branches of agriculture; their families may have small farms, and they have no objection to agricultural labour.

2199. Do they appear to you generally in a state of health and strength sufficient for the labour of agriculture?—So far as my experience goes, I should say they were fit for it; those who have come down from the country have not appeared so strong, but that I attribute to what they have suffered.

2200. Is the disposition on the part of the poor of Lancashire to emigrate to the United States, instead of the British colonies in America?—Yes, it is at present, in consequence of many of them having friends settled there, and in consequence of the growth of manufactures in the Northern States.

2201. When you say that the provisions for the passage would not exceed 25*s.* or 30*s.*, is your opinion formed under the idea that the provisions of the Passengers Act would be enforced?—No; the provisions mentioned in the Act would cost about two pounds, but they are not fit for them, nor such as they are used to, nor such as have been generally taken.

2202. Is there any law regulating the treatment of passengers in American vessels?—There is a law of the United States regulating the number of passengers in American vessels.

2203.

B b

2203. Does

Mr.
W. S. Fitzgerald.
31 March,
1827.

Mr.
W. A. Pitt-Rivers.
31 March,
1857.

2203. Does that law contain any enactment as to the species of provisions to be provided?—My memory does not enable me to recollect, but I think it does.

2204. Ever since you have been conversant with providing passages for persons wishing to emigrate, the present Passengers Act has been in force?—There was an Act previous to the present one, but the provisions were pretty similar.

2205. In point of fact, ever since you have been employed upon this duty, as to passengers, the law has been the same as that now in force?—Yes, except as to the number.

2206. Did you ever know any inconvenience arise to passengers from the ships in which they have gone?—I have seen ships over-crowded from want of room.

2207. It is not consistent with your knowledge, that any positive evil has arisen from that circumstance?—The evil consists, in my opinion, in the inconvenience to which the passengers have been subject during the voyage, and of which they were not aware when they made the engagement.

2208. Have you ever heard any complaints upon the subject?—Often.

2209. Have you known such evils to result since the Passengers Act?—Yes.

2210. And you think the Act, as it stands, is insufficient to prevent it?—It is chiefly where the Act has not been put in force.

2211. The alterations you have suggested are, to render the provisions of the Passengers Act, as it now stands, more specific?—There are some additional clauses in the manuscript Bill, on which my observations are made; the manuscript Bill varies from the Act now in force considerably.

2212. Did more passengers go to the British colonies some years ago, than now?—Yes, from Liverpool, some years ago; but at present I do not conceive there are on the whole fewer that go; the alteration is, that they now go from Ireland instead of going from Liverpool; vessels are chartered at Liverpool and taken over to Ireland, where they embark.

2213. Do you happen to know, whether as many go from Scotland as went a few years ago?—My information does not extend to Scotland.

2214. At present the power of going as emigrants is pretty much limited to those who have got a little money; is it not; persons in the state of paupers have no means of going?—No, they have not; and I have letters here from many manufacturers requesting me to obtain service for them, and have their passage paid over.

2215. Have any proposals been made to you from gentlemen in the country, or landowners, stating their readiness to provide a fund to send out any of the poorer emigrants?—When I left Liverpool, there was an overseer of a parish in Kent engaging a passage for a number of poor people in his parish to go out to New York, and during the last two years the passages to the United States of a considerable number have been paid by parishes.

2216. Do you think if an increased facility was given to obtain grants of land in the British settlements, that that would encourage emigration from any of the districts in England where the hand-loom weavers wish to remove?—I am satisfied it would, provided it was connected with the means of getting out there, which at present they do not possess.

2217. Is there not a remedy now existing at common law, both here and on the other side of the Atlantic, whether in the United States or the British colonies, for frauds committed by masters of vessels, or improper treatment of the passengers while on board?—There is a remedy at common law; but it is out of the reach of the passengers to take advantage of it, in consequence of their poverty and their inability to stop for the sessions; I may state, that the prosecution last year cost the merchants of Liverpool 150*l.*; that was of course out of the power of the passengers themselves to pay.

2218. In point of fact are the regulations of the present Passengers Act ever complied with, or are they generally evaded?—As to the numbers they take on board, the Act is complied with; as to provisions, I do not think it is; no notice is taken of the provisions put on board.

2219. Do you imagine that those suggestions which you offer, with regard to the doctor and the quantity of medicine, would be more likely to be complied with than the existing regulation?—I am not satisfied of the necessity for a doctor to the United States or the British possessions; there is a doctor required by the manuscript Bill.

2220. Upon

Mr.
W. S. Furbush
24 March,
1827.

2220. Upon the whole, do you not think that the whole matter of provisions might safely be left to the prudence of the passengers themselves?—I think not quite; I have been told, by the masters of vessels, of persons secreting themselves on board, and others coming on board without provisions.

2221. Have you ever known any case of serious want or distress in any vessel since 1823, on its passage either to New York, or to British America?—No, never.

2222. And yet during that time the regulations with regard to the quantity of provisions have been evaded?—With regard to the quality rather than as to the quantity.

2223. Do you believe that the regulation as to quantity has been complied with?—As to a sufficient quantity it has been complied with, but not as to the kind, because the parties who emigrate have not been in the habit of using such provisions as the Act requires to be put on board.

2224. You stated they used potatoes sometimes?—Generally.

2225. Are you not of opinion, that if the regulations of the Passengers Act were altered, that it would not be necessary to have one set of regulations for the passage to New York, and another to Quebec or Halifax?—I should think one Bill might embody the regulations as to both; it is so in the manuscript Bill I have read.

2226. How is it possible to carry into effect the regulations respecting the quantity of provisions, in the various small ports of the kingdom?—There are no ports where vessels clear out where there is not a collector of the customs, and it is the duty of his officers to see that the regulations of the Act are enforced.

2227. You state they are practically enforced in Liverpool, in consequence of your being appointed an agent to see that they are enforced?—I was not appointed for the purpose of enforcing the regulations of the Act of Parliament, but rather to secure, under the sanction of the merchants of Liverpool, an office where the emigrants might find fair dealing.

2228. In point of fact, you see that they are fairly dealt by?—It is my duty to do so, and I act under a committee of merchants.

2229. In the small ports of the kingdom, would the collector of the customs undertake that duty which you perform at Liverpool?—I imagine it would not be necessary in small ports of the kingdom, because there is not much emigration from them; and the imposition is not generally upon the part of the captains, but on the part of persons who act as passenger brokers, who are under no sanction or control, and who, in Liverpool, generally speaking, are men of bad character.

2230. If the regulations for passages on board British vessels were vexatious or inconvenient, would not the effect be to drive the passengers to American vessels?—Certainly it would.

2231. You have stated the tonnage of vessels going out from Liverpool to the British colonies; is not that tonnage so much greater than can possibly be wanted for the accommodation of any number of emigrants that may be going, that there can be no temptation on the part of shipowners, even without any Act of Parliament, to overload their vessels with passengers?—The temptation rests here; the captain of a vessel will not take a few passengers at a very low rate, and a broker will take up one vessel, although there may be ten in the port, and that vessel, in consequence of taking a lower rate of freight than the others, will be overcrowded, whilst the others go empty; if there were proper regulations, each vessel would take her proportion.

2232. What is the usual time of vessels sailing from Liverpool to the British possessions?—From the early part of April to September or October.

2233. If any alteration were made in the Passengers Act, would it not be very convenient that those provisions should be carried into effect at an early period?—It would be desirable certainly that it should be carried into effect early.

2234. Most of the ships sail in the month of May?—A great many sail in June and July.

2235. With regard to the manufacturers that you state go out in such numbers, do they carry out any implements of their trade with them?—They are not allowed by law to take out certain articles relating to the linen, cotton, silk, and woollen manufactures.

237.

B h 2

2236. Are

Mr.
W. S. Fitzbush,
31 March,
1827.

2236. Are you inclined to think they take them out clandestinely to any extent?
—Not to any great extent.

2237. From your situation, can you inform the Committee, whether there is a considerable demand for operative weavers emigrating, in the United States?—There has been a greater demand than exists at present, in consequence of the low price of manufactured goods in this country. I understand the manufactures in the United States are not prospering, but, notwithstanding that, the weavers are going out fast, and I have letters, stating that they understand their prospect will be good in the United States.

2238. There is at present a demand for an increase of population in the United States from this country?—There appears to be so.

2239. Can you give the Committee any letters that will show the disposition that exists among the manufacturers to emigrate?—I can leave these letters, which I will hand in. I have selected those for that purpose, from about 150 letters I have received upon the same subject.

[The Witnesses delivered in the following Letters.]

" Sir,

"

March 19, 1827."

" I HAVE to inform you, that cannot get ready to go to Portsmouth, so he will go in the same ship with the rest of his neighbours, to New York. Sir, you must do the best you can for them, and state the lowest that they can go for, as they are poor working people that is driven from their homes to seek a living in a foreign land, having collected their little remains to go with, and they will but have little to stop in Liverpool, so I would have you to be particular about the time of sailing. The first family is and wife and eight children; four sons, the first is twenty years, the second eighteen, the third sixteen, the fourth thirteen and a half; four girls, the first eleven years, the second eight, the third six, the fourth four; that makes ten in that family. The second family is widow herself and five sons; one is twelve years old; that makes six in that family. The third family is and wife, and three daughters and one son; one daughter a woman, one eight years old, one twelve years, one six months; son fifteen weeks old; that is six in that family. The fourth family, and wife, daughter thirteen, eleven and six months, ten, eight, six, four, two and six months, six months; that is eleven in that family. There is one man and his wife; there is six men; that is all at present; total forty-one. Sir, there is a woman of the name of from Darwen, she wants to know what ship will sail the next, as she wants to go to her husband; you know her husband, he sailed in the she sailed on the 3d of January. Now, Sir, you must let me know by the return of post, as she may be making ready, as she wishes to sail on the first of April, or as soon after as possible. So I remain

" Yours, with the greatest respect,

"

"

Directed to

" Mr. William S. Fitzbush,

No. 11, Brook's-square, Cooper's-row, Liverpool."

" Sir,

"

14 May 1826."

" HAVING, through the got information of your benevolent institution, I shall with gratitude avail myself of the benefit it may afford in giving the necessary information respecting passages to the States. I am a weaver by trade, and has for some years back been engaged in the management of power-looms; I have a wife and four children, the oldest eight years of age. My object is to go to the United States, but not knowing at what place it would be likely for to meet with immediate employ, I would be thankful for information on that point. A friend of mine intends going with me, he is a dresser for power-looms; he has a wife and two children, the oldest four years of age; but I fear his means will not be sufficient to accomplish his desire; he can raise but 8*l*. and it is not in my power to be of any service to him, as 14*l*. is all I can realize. You now see our situation; if you think what I have stated will be sufficient to pay passage and secure provisions, with the necessary expenses of conveying our families to Liverpool, we will be very thankful if you would engage a passage for us to what-

ever

ever place you think most likely to find employment. We cannot be ready sooner than the 20th of this month, and to stop much longer would be attended with inconvenience. Please let us know if certificates will be required in passing the Custom. In doing these things, you will very much oblige your humble Servant,

Mr.
W. S. Fitzhugh.
25 March,
1827.

Directed

" W. S. Fitzhugh, Passengers Office,
11, Brook's-square, Cuiper's-row, Liverpool."

" To the American Chamber of Commerce.

" Gentlemen,

May 29, 1826.

" We would take it as a particular favour, if you would state the rate of passage for a man and his wife, with one child, without victuals; what for a man and his wife, and five children, all under twelve years of age, without victuals.—P. S. Please to state rate of passage without victuals, for one man, all to Boston. We are cotton spinners, and could wish to change our situation for that of a better, as we hear our business is improving very much in the United States of America. We remain, Sir, your very humble Servant,

Directed to

" Mr. W. S. Fitzhugh,
Cooper's-row, Liverpool."

" Sir,

Aug. the 28th, 1826.

" I HAVE your will excuse my boldness in taking the liberty in addressing these few lines to you, I, and others, wishing to inform you, that I and others wish to go to America, and we desire your assistance how to proceed, and to put us in the way. I now inform you of the place that we are intending to go, the name of the place is three miles from America; this is our information that we have obtained. The name of one of the employers is cotton manufacturer; the establishment is cotton spinning, cotton weaving, and printing the same. I will take the management of spinning if I can get a situation, as being in that occupation upwards of 24 years, and has assisted in gaiting six new mills of cotton spinning. The next is my friend cotton carder for 26 years, and has assisted in gaiting ten new cotton mills. The next is an engineer, and is qualified to take the management of an engine in all its branches, and is also a coal miner, and understanding its branches. I have four sons and two daughters, all qualified for work, three spinners, one machine maker. has two spinners, and two girls that work in the preparing part. has one son a joiner, and four daughters that work in the preparing part, that is, in the card-room. I must say that self praise is no commendation, but I can assure you that they are as useful as any three families that can be produced in Lancashire. We have the means in our own hands of getting over, that is, paying our own passage; we are all in work, and do not intend to remove until spring. We could wish, if possible, to get information from the firm above mentioned, as we have a great desire to tread upon the land of freedom. The reason we wrote to you is, by one of your cards being put into our hands; we hope you will be honest, and please to give us every information you can, and inform us how soon we may obtain a letter from the firm. Sir, please to write by return of post. Direct for Lancashire.

" Your most obedient and humble Servant,

Directed to " Mr. W. S. Fitzhugh,
No. 11, Brook's-square, Cooper's-row, Liverpool."

Mr.
W. S. Fitzhugh.

31 March,
1827.

" Sir,

"

May 30, 1826.

" THIS is to inform you I am intending to go to either New York or Philadelphia, and what will the passage be if it is paid down? But I think I cannot raise the money before I land, because I have a quantity of goods to dispose of that I really cannot make my money of in this country. But farther, I will hire myself for six or twelve months at my business; or your captain may bind me first for that time if he will give a wages that will keep me and my wife, for there is no good to be done in this part. I have a few more friends will go, if you will take the hiring proposal. I would wish you to write by return of post, whether you will take the proposal of the before-mentioned, and after you have sent me an answer I will pay you for the same. When you write, direct to
and you will oblige me, I could wish to sail
about August or September vessel."

Directed " Mr. W. S. Fitzhugh,
11, Brook's-square, Cooper's-row, Liverpool."

" Sir,

"

5th Nov. 1826.

" HAVING seen one of your cards, whereby it appears you are in the habit of engaging emigrant passengers to America, and also affording them useful information, I have, in consequence of that, taken the liberty to desire you will have the goodness to state the lowest price for which you could engage a company of passengers either for Philadelphia or Baltimore (suppose ten in number;) and also to ask, whether you can point out any establishment in the United States where they are likely to want a number of intelligent operatives or mechanics. In like manner, I beg you will inform me whether you will have a ship going out to either of the above places on or about the first day of January 1827.

Directed to

" W. S. Fitzhugh,
Cooper's-row, Liverpool."

" Yours, &c. &c. &c.

"

"

" Sir,

"

February 28th, 1827.

" IN consequence of the numerous applications made at this office by persons wishing to emigrate to the United States, as to the proper offices to apply at for information respecting freight and passage, we are disposed to recommend the
as a desirable medium for advertising; and, from its extensive circulation in this and the adjoining counties, it is highly probable that much valuable information would be conveyed into those districts where the present commercial distress prevails in an eminent degree. All favours will be thankfully received, and promptly attended to.

" I am, Sir,

"

"

"

"

"

"

" Sir,

Feb. 5th, 1827.

" I BEG permission to say, that two competent managers, fitters-up and engine-builders, which two mechanics are thoroughly acquainted with all kinds and additions of the steam engine, and a great many other machineries, such as weighing-machines, millwrighting, corn-mill manufacturers, &c.; and one of them is greatly acquainted with blast-furnaces, i.e. the managing of them; the other with the art of mixing metals, commonly called a reener-out or a refinery man, i.e. one who works a refining fire. They are both competent managers and manufacturers of pumps, &c. In reality, they are two of the first-rate common mechanics, and they
cuh

can produce characters, as such, from their masters and from those for whom they have manufactured engines, &c. Sir, I solicit you, if you please, to write to me, saying whether the two men can have their passage paid for them previous to their going on board of ship, to go into any part of the North of America, but New York is much desired, and the time when the next ship sails for New York. —Please to direct for

Mr.
W. S. Fishback.
31 March,
1827.

" Sir,
" IN consequence of a note from you, in a letter sent me from Liverpool by
" I take the liberty to write this to you, and request by return of
post, if possible, an answer to the following queries: 1st. When will the next
vessel leave Liverpool for New York. 2d. What will be the lowest fare for a single
man's passage there; what for a man and his wife, and three children. 3d. What
will be the expense of provisions for the voyage; in short, with how small a sum
could a single man be sure of being taken from Liverpool to New York for, and the
same as to a man with a family of 3 or 4 children. An answer from you to these
questions will much oblige
Yours truly,

" Sir,
" I SHALL thank you to send me correct information on the following heads
of Emigration: 1st. Is there any American vessel that will take passengers free,
if they will be bound to serve for a limited time, for their passage, and how long,
and what sort will suit best. 2d. What will be the fare, per head, if a few engage
to work what they call their passage over. 3d. What is the lowest, per head, to
go in the steerage, having all things found by the captain, and what, if they pro-
vision for themselves; also, the time of sailing of any American vessel you think
will suit the above questions. Please to direct as soon as possible by the post.
Direct,

" Sir,
" I COULD wish you to send me a few lines concerning a passage to the United
States of America, as I am very desirous of going to that country, if it be possible
that I can get there, for I have some friends in the county of La Fayette Province,
in Pennsylvania, if I was once there; therefore I could wish you to send me word
how to proceed about going, and what you think is the lowest possible fare to
Philadelphia or Baltimore, as I am a poor man and can get no work here, and
about a few months since could command as much money as would have
taken me there well, but now is reduced to the small sum of four pounds, and is
working for meat. I hope you will excuse me for writing to you, but as I could
wish to be informed on the subject, and seeing

There are several more are desirous to go, but I am very desirous to
go, so I hope you will send me word how to apply, and what you think of it, and
write to me as soon as you can.
Yours,

" Sir,
" WE have a young man and his wife but no family, also a single young man,
in this neighbourhood, desirous of going to New York or Boston, and they have
desired me to write to you, to know what is the most reasonable passage in the
steerage; also, whether beds, or what furniture would be useful; also, what it will cost
to provide proper provisions, in short how much it will cost them from the time they
go into the ship till they are landed. You will, I dare say, remember my brother
going out and taking some men last summer. Your answer to this
immediately will oblige. We perceive some of the newspapers say there has been
some disturbances and lives lost in it is all lies, every thing is very quiet,
and the people will all defend their own mills, having pikes and fire-arms.

" Your obedient Servant,

Mr.
W. S. Fitchg.

31 March,
1827.

" Sir,

" May 3d, 1826.

" WE write unto you, to inform us whether there is any printers wanted in America, or not; and if there is any wanted, will you have the goodness to write a few lines unto us, and the money you take for one sail and victuals from Liverpool to America; and will you have the goodness to write the time your ships is going off. And if you write a few lines, direct it to calico-printer, I forgot this, could you do such a thing as hire two; if you could, write a few lines unto me as soon as you can make it convenient, and we will make you a visit." . . .

2240. Have you received any account from any of the poorest persons, of those whom you have assisted to emigrate, of their present situation there?—I have seen letters from some of them to their friends, recommending them to come out to them; a man will frequently go out and leave his family in England, having only money enough to take himself over, but by labouring there a year or a year and a half he obtained sufficient to send for his family; that occurs every year; and sometimes we have sixty or seventy individuals in a vessel, whose passages are paid in America by their friends, who have gone out without any property.

2241. Do you know the greatest quantity that went out last year?—I cannot state the number with any positive certainty; that emigrated from Liverpool might be from five to six thousand.

2242. Do the vessels that go out generally go full of steerage passengers?—Not full, they have only one for every two tons of actual space; but generally, in consequence of having so many vessels going out, one for every five tons of register hurthern is taken; there are so many vessels going out from Liverpool, that there is no necessity to overload them, and where they have been overloaded, it arises entirely from the law permitting a great number to go in one vessel, by which means it becomes the interest of the party to make exertions to get one vessel, and one only, full.

2243. Is the tendency of voluntary emigration to the United States more to the northern or southern districts?—Entirely to the northern; there are none go to the southward of Virginia, or Maryland.

2244. Nor to the northward of New York?—Yes, some to Boston.

Mr. Thomas Adams, called in; and Examined

2245. WHERE do you reside?—At Mildenhall, in Suffolk.

2246. Will you state shortly the circumstance regarding the poor in your parish?—At the present moment, the number of persons paying rates are 268; those unable to pay, 315; paupers in the workhouse, 37; maintained out of the house, from the poor rates, 87; making a total of 1245;—110 employed in useless or unnecessary labour, 60 men and 41 boys. The amount of the poor rates in 1822, was 2,714*l.* 6*s.* 1*d.*; in 1823, 3,151*l.*; in 1824, 3,807*l.*; in 1825, 3,968*l.*; in 1826, 3,420*l.*; the assessment of the parish 7,000*l.*; the assessment at two-thirds of the rack-rent. There are upwards of 16,000 acres of land in the parish. The parish of Mildenhall is situated on the borders of a fen, called the Bedford Level, and the labourers would not be inclined to emigrate, as many of them, during the months from May to November, are employed in the fen called the Bedford Level, some of them at a distance of from 40 to 60 miles from home, where their earnings are, in many instances, sufficient to support them through the year; but as the parish officers are unable to ascertain what their earnings are, they come upon them immediately on their return home, and they are maintained at the expense of the parish.

2247. Have you had an opportunity of reading or understanding the Evidence given before this Committee, upon the subject of charging the parochial rates, to raise a fund for the purposes of emigration?—I have.

2248. Are you of opinion that the rate payers of Mildenhall would be disposed to avail themselves of any legislative measure, to charge themselves with a fund necessary to defray the expenses to get rid of the redundant poor?—I think they would.

2249. Do you think they would be disposed to consent to pay for 10 years, 7*l.* 10*s.* per annum, to raise 60*l.* to get rid of a family consisting of a man, woman, and three children?—I think they would.

Mr.
Thomas Adams.

Mortis, 5^a die Aprilis, 1827.

The Lord Bishop of *Cheter*, attending by permission of the House of Lords; Examined.

2250. YOUR Lordship is Chairman of the London Committee for the Relief of the Manufacturing Districts?—I am not permanent chairman; the rule is, that the member of the committee who is the first in attendance shall take the chair; I, living near the place where the committee meets, have very often the honour to fill the chair.

The Lord
Bishop of *Cheter*.

3 April,
1827.

2251. Has the proposed plan of Emigration been taken into consideration by the London Relief Committee?—It has.

2252. Has your Lordship, as chairman of the committee, any Resolutions to report to this Committee, which took place on Saturday last?—I have. After some discussion, the Committee for the Relief of the distressed Manufacturers have come to the following resolution, that the sum of 25,000*l.* be appropriated to promote the object of emigration; it being understood that twice that sum will be furnished from some other source, and that it is to be appropriated in such a manner, under the direction of the Emigration Committee, or of persons appointed by the proper authority, as may be satisfactory to the Relief Committee.

2253. Are the Committee to understand that the grant of 25,000*l.* from the London Relief Committee is not to take place, except under the condition that 50,000*l.* are obtained from some other source?—I think I may answer to the Committee, that such is their feeling; the question itself was not discussed, but that is the basis that was proceeded upon from the beginning.

2254. Is it the opinion of the London Committee as a body, that relief afforded by means of emigration is not only the most effectual, but in point of fact the cheapest means of relief which can be given in the present state of distress?—It is now decidedly the opinion of the committee, that it is both the cheapest and the most effectual method. That it is the cheapest, may be proved by a very simple calculation; that it is the most effectual is matter of opinion, about which this Committee are much more competent to form their judgment than we are. We certainly are of that opinion, thinking that it is extremely advantageous to draw off the redundant population, as not only increasing the employment of those who remain, and raising their wages, but also as taking off the materials of future distress.

2255. Are the Committee to understand from the reservation which your Lordship mentions as to the disposal of the money being satisfactory to the Relief Committee, that they are disposed to consider as satisfactory the expenditure of 60*l.* per family upon their location in the provinces, according to the plan proposed?—I understand quite so; and any doubt which may exist as to the future disposal of the money voted by that committee, does not refer to the amount which is to be expended upon the cost of emigration, but rather to the description of persons for whose advantage it is to be expended. I will explain in a few words what I mean: the London Committee for the Relief of the distressed Manufacturers have all along considered that enough has not been done in Scotland, by the inhabitants of that part of the United Empire, for the relief of their local distresses. We have had considerable difficulty not only in the first instance in obtaining contributions, but in obtaining information from Scotland as to the mode in which they have distributed our grants; and it is only within the last week that we have had any such account of the distribution of our grants as can be deemed at all satisfactory. We have voted very large sums to Scotland, which we believe have been judiciously and effectively distributed; but we think we have not been treated with that confidence by the managers of charitable funds in Scotland which the extent of our liberality to them deserved. I do not speak of the local contributions in the respective districts, but of the central committee in Edinburgh. I do not wish to cast the least reflection on the exertions made in Lanarkshire and Renfrewshire, which have been highly praiseworthy. Our receipts from Scotland have been almost none; and we are persuaded that the great mass of subscriptions which have been raised for the relief of the distressed manufacturers in this

The Lord
Bishop of Clonfert.

3 April,
1857.

country has been contributed under an impression, that it was to be chiefly, if not entirely, expended in relieving the pressure which bore so heavily upon our own manufacturing districts, more properly so called. We have not indeed acted strictly and exclusively upon that principle in the distribution of our funds, but if in apportioning the sum which we have voted for the promotion of Emigration, it should appear to the public that by far the greater portion of it has gone to assist in the emigration of weavers from Scotland, some dissatisfaction would perhaps be excited in the minds of those who contributed to the fund; and that, I think, is one of the great difficulties which embarrass the present proceeding of the London Committee in conjunction with the Emigration Committee. I am not prepared to say that we must not have that opinion of a part of the public, but I am quite persuaded that there would be some dissatisfaction if we made a very large grant for emigrants, the greater proportion of which was to go to Scotland.

2256. Is your Lordship aware that very extensive preparations have been made, and are in a great state of forwardness at this moment, for removing emigrants from Renfrewshire and Lanarkshire, which there is reason to believe have not taken place in the manufacturing districts of England?—I have understood so only from a statement made by Mr. Stanley, on Saturday last, to the Relief Committee. I do not mean to infer that we have given to Scotland more than Scotland wanted, or nearly so much; but we have given more to Scotland, in proportion to the contributions from Scotland, than we have to the manufacturing districts *here*, in proportion to their contributions; and I think it ought not to be forgotten, that the most distressed of the manufacturing districts in England have, to the last, contributed most liberally to our funds.

2257. Are there any means of ascertaining the amount of subscriptions to the London Relief Committee which have been obtained from the several districts of England and Scotland?—Certainly.

2258. Has your Lordship any reason to believe that any of the contributions made by the Relief Committee have been to the effect of producing any permanent relief, or that they have not been entirely appropriated hitherto to supply the means to the sufferer of living from day to day?—I do not apprehend that any measures which we have adopted can properly be called measures tending to the permanent relief of the poor; but we have certainly endeavoured to combine the two objects, of present relief with present usefulness and labour; and to that end, we have made considerable grants, for the purpose of enabling the local committees, and latterly under the direction of Mr. M'Adam, to repair the roads of those districts where such repairs were much wanted. We have not devised (indeed I do not see how it is possible we should devise) any permanent employment for the men, or point out any new channels into which their labour could be permanently diverted; but we have been always desirous of doing something more than merely relieving the present wants of nature; we have always wished, if possible, to teach the poor people that they must not expect *elemosynary* relief, unless they were disposed to give, in return, such a proportion of their labour as could be reasonably asked for.

2259. Is your Lordship of opinion there has been a less disposition on the part of the richer classes in Scotland to contribute to the relief of the distressed persons in that country, than has existed, in a proportionate manner to their means, in this?—I really do not possess data sufficient to give an opinion, which would involve in some measure the character of that country; I really would not give an opinion upon that subject; but thus much I must say, that we did not in the outset of our labours experience that cordiality on the part of the leading people of Scotland, which we thought we had a right to expect; they came and asked for large sums, but they would not tell us what they would do at home. It was a long time before the Edinburgh committee would hold free communication with us; it was not until we made an express stipulation that they should not have any money from us, unless they gave us an account of the sums which they raised, and their expenditure at home, that we could establish any thing like communication with them.

2260. Your Lordship had opportunities, not only as connected with the London Relief Committee, but also in your personal visitation of your diocese, of making yourself well acquainted with the state of the lower classes within it; perhaps your Lordship will be good enough to inform the Committee which of the manu-
facturing

facturing districts are comprised within the diocese of Chester?—The whole of Lancashire and Cheshire, a part of the West Riding of Yorkshire, the southern parts of Cumberland and Westmoreland, but I hardly know whether that is to be called a manufacturing district.

2261. In general terms, the Committee may understand the diocese of Chester comprises almost the whole of the northern English manufacturing districts?—With the exception of the clothing district of Yorkshire, a small proportion of which only is within the diocese of Chester.

2262. In the visitations which your Lordship has made in your diocese, what has appeared to you to be the general state of the lower and middling classes at this moment?—In the course of the last summer I had occasion to go twice into what may perhaps be considered the most distressed part of the manufacturing district at that time; comprising Manchester, Bolton-in-the-Moors, Newchurch in Rossendale, the neighbourhood of Barnsley, the town of Blackburn, and the adjacent country; and, as far as was consistent with the official duties about which I was employed, I made it my particular business to inquire into the state of the manufacturing population, having previously been in correspondence with the clergy of the different parishes situated in the manufacturing districts, through whom, in conjunction with the more respectable inhabitants of the respective parishes, grants from the London Committee were in general transmitted to those districts. My first visit was in September, and my second about six weeks afterwards; I did not find at that time the distress quite so great as it had been represented to be. I was told by the most intelligent manufacturers, that they had sometimes experienced a more intense distress, but none more general or more sudden. Amongst the people themselves I observed the greatest quietness and good order, a degree of contentedness, under pressure to which they were quite unused, which excited my admiration. Since that time, I have every reason to believe that while in some places the distress has been very considerably diminished, in others it has increased in at least an equal proportion. I am satisfied, from inquiry, that there was no probability of a return, to any considerable extent, of employment to the hand-loom weavers; yet I am also satisfied that the decay of that branch of trade will by no means be so sudden as has been apprehended. In the town of Bolton alone, I believe, there are not fewer than 8,000 hand-loom weavers, and the local committee of that place, who are remarkably intelligent and active, seemed utterly to despair of employment for the greater part of that number, even should manufactures revive to a greater extent than is at present anticipated. There are two distinct classes of hand-loom weavers in Lancashire; those who are living in the large towns, for instance in Bolton, and those in the country places amongst the hills, who are not only hand-loom weavers, but also little farmers, and they are at this moment by far the most distressed class of persons in Lancashire, for it has been their custom to take small tracts of land at high rents, which the husband and his sons cultivate, while the woman and her daughters have two, three or four hand looms in the house, from the profits of which they have been accustomed to pay their rents; and it is obvious to remark, that at the same time that their loom-work fails them, their poor rates are increased, for the relief of other weavers who have no land, and so they are ruined in two directions.

2263. In the case of those hand-loom weavers who are also small farmers, upon what duration of lease do they generally hold, or are they tenants at will?—I believe they are generally tenants at will; one gentleman told me he had a very considerable tract of land all at once thrown upon his hands in the neighbourhood of Blackburn. In some of those country places, particularly for instance Padilham, the poor rates during the last year increased to six-and-twenty shillings in the pound upon the rack-rent.

2264. Has your Lordship any means of estimating the proportion between those two classes of weavers, those who are congregated in towns and those dispersed in the country?—I should think, putting Manchester out of the question, that those hand-loom weavers in the country are very nearly equal to those in the towns.

2265. What is the population from whom the poor rate is levied?—As far as we can collect from our returns, all but the poorest are assessed for the relief of the very poorest, such as in the parish of Bethnal Green, where the poor have been supporting the poor, till at last they are no longer able to go on, and now the parish is borrowing money.

227.

C c 2

2266. Do

The Lord
Bishop of Chester.

3 April,
1827.

The Lord
Bishop of Chester.

3 April,
1847.

2266. Do those poor live in houses built for the purpose of holding weavers, and not the property of the weavers themselves?—I am hardly competent to say how the houses are built; in many places where a large factory is set up, cottages are built by the proprietor of the factory, or the landowner or the person possessed of land, which he lets on lease to the manufacturers.

2267. Is the Committee to understand that it is in your Lordship's opinion, that the hand-loom weavers of those country districts are in greater distress than the hand-loom weavers in the towns?—I think so, certainly.

2268. Would it not also appear, that from their knowledge, in some degree, of agriculture, they would be likely to make better settlers in a new country than the men taken entirely from the towns?—Undoubtedly; and I meant to mention that as an advantage; but I am afraid that is one of the great evils which will attend this or any other plan of emigration, that you must send the best workmen out of the country.

2269. Does not your Lordship understand that in the towns the hand-loom weavers will be sooner absorbed by the factories than those in the country?—Yes. I think it may not be irrelevant to state to the Committee, that there is a great distinction to be made between the hand-loom weavers in different towns; for instance, a great part of the weavers in Wigan are hand-loom weavers, but for a long time they suffered comparatively no distress, the trade of Wigan kept up pretty well during the greater part of the distress; of course it depends very much upon the nature of the goods they have to make.

2270. Can your Lordship state whether many of those persons who, according to your evidence, in such numbers receive relief from the parishes, are Irish, in the parts of Lancashire to which you refer?—There are certainly Irish in some of the smaller towns, and a very great proportion in the large towns, but I think not in the villages.

2271. Your Lordship has stated, that at your last visit you found the distress increased in some districts and decreased in others; have the goodness to state whether that is applicable to any particular trade belonging to one district or the other?—No; I think it is very much referable to the circumstance to which allusion has been made, that in the larger towns the hand-loom weavers are more ready to take advantage of the least increase in the facilities of labour afforded by the power-loom, and that they are absorbed in the power-loom population. There is no such opportunity afforded to the hand-loom weavers in the villages, whose distress has been uniformly increasing from the first decline of trade.

2272. Are the branches of the London Relief Committee so generally spread, that communications can be had without loss of time with the class of hand-loom weavers in the districts of Yorkshire?—There will be no difficulty whatever. They are, however, not exactly branches of our committee, but they are local committees approved of by us, who have been in regular correspondence with us, and through whom any wish of our own, or of the Emigration Committee, can be immediately transmitted to the great body of the population.

2273. Does your Lordship think that by means of those committees, and by the resident gentlemen, a return can be easily made of the number of persons in the remoter districts of Lancashire, who would be ready to embrace an immediate offer of emigration?—I have no doubt such information could be very soon obtained.

2274. Is it your opinion that the removal of a portion of the hand-loom weavers from the towns would have any material effect on the circumstances of the other branch of hand-loom weavers who live in the country?—If the hand-loom weavers in the towns have enough to do, they will not emigrate; and if they have not enough to do, none of their work will go to the hand-loom weavers in the country. There is one circumstance, however, which is somewhat singular, that even at the present time, where a great degree of distress prevails, as in Blackburn and the neighbourhood, work is occasionally sent to hand-loom weavers at the distance of fifty miles from the place. In the chapelry of Dent, between Sedburgh and Kendal, partial relief has been afforded to hand-loom weaving by work sent from Blackburn.

2275. Has it come to your Lordship's knowledge that hand-loom weaving has been carried on under the superintendence of the overseers in some of the poorer parishes, with a view to a diminution of the rates, though not affording any remuneration

2 April,
1827.

remuneration to the workmen!—No, I was not aware of that. Mr. Noble, the clergyman of Whalley, purchased materials and put out work to the distressed weavers; they were paid for their work at a low rate, but I believe not lower than the price of weaving was at that time; it was given to those men who could not get work as weavers, they were paid for their work as if employed by manufacturers; but this was discontinued, from an apprehension that it was only adding to the evil, by increasing the stock of manufactured goods, which at that time overloaded the market.

2276. Is it your Lordship's opinion that the state of distress of the country hand-loom weavers is such that they would readily embrace any prospect of an emigration which might be now held out to them?—I have no doubt of it, except in cases where peculiar local connexions tie them to the spot; but the great mass of them would, I am sure.

2277. If the leases which these persons hold are generally for a year, what are the difficulties which your Lordship foresees in carrying into effect any system of immediate emigration, in regard to them?—I do not see any difficulty so far as they are concerned, but only to the effect of it on the prosperity of the country, so much land being immediately thrown upon the hands of the landlords, that is a question which the landlords must consider.

2278. Does your Lordship think that the rents of these lands have been paid?—Not for the last year, certainly.

2279. Do you think there is a general feeling, on the part of the owners of land in the districts of which you have spoken, that they have to a ruinous extent subdivided their lands, and over-built upon them?—I have not had much conversation with the owners of lands, with the exception of Mr. Hulton. I have no doubt they find, by dear-bought experience, that such is the case; but I am not prepared to state instances.

2280. In point of fact, under the present circumstances, does your Lordship think that the giving up these cottages, with the small portion of land belonging to them, would be a material loss to the landlord?—Up to the last year they paid, I believe, large rents for their cottages; it is not unusual to pay as much as eight pounds per annum for a cottage.

2281. Supposing it were proved that there is no expectation of that class of small farmers and manufacturers having a return of profitable trade, would not the means of paying rent for those lands and cottages equally be lost to the landlord?—If it were possible to take away any class of weavers, the consequence of whose emigration should be the return of work to those country weavers, that would perhaps be the most desirable thing which could be done; but I do not see how that it is to be effected; I do not, as I observed before, see that the taking away three or four thousand hand-loom weavers in any large town, would throw much work into the hands of the country weavers.

2282. Will your Lordship have the goodness to state what you consider would be the effect of the removal of a large number of country hand-loom weavers on the situation of the remaining hand-loom weavers in the country districts?—It must be an improvement, for, whatever work there is, or a great part of that work, will remain for a time. I think some considerable time must elapse before the hand-loom weaving will be quite extinct. If half of the weavers in any country place were removed, there will of course be more work and higher wages for those who remain; and they will, it is to be hoped, find out some other resources against the time when the final extinction of that branch of labour takes place.

2283. If such increase of remuneration arose to those who remain, and the houses of the persons removed were not pulled down, what other modes would exist, of preventing other persons coming into the neighbourhood, to take up their places?—I was about to take the liberty of remarking, that from the inquiries I have made on that point, I am satisfied that unless the Legislature adopts some measure for bettering the state of Ireland, simultaneously with that of the manufacturing districts of Scotland and England, you may carry Emigration to almost any extent, without producing any good effect; for if you withdraw a certain proportion of the population from Lancashire, in order to increase the wages and comforts of those who remain, you will immediately have an influx from Ireland of persons who, from their peculiar habits of life, can afford—when I use the term afford, I mean that they can bear, with relation to their natural wants—to work

The Lord
Bishop of Chester.

3 April,
1847.

for a much smaller sum than the Lancashire weavers can; and therefore the places of those who emigrate, will be occupied by weavers from Ireland; we find that is the case now.

2284. When your Lordship speaks of ameliorating the state of Ireland, are the Committee to understand your Lordship to refer to a plan of emigration for the superabundant population, as applied to the state of that country?—I am not prepared to give an opinion on that point; but if emigration is to be encouraged from Ireland, it must be an emigration westward, and not eastward.

2285. If the effect of the removal either of the town or country weavers were to raise wages, has your Lordship any doubt that the master manufacturers would make immediate efforts to supply their place?—I have no doubt that the master manufacturers there, who are a very peculiar class of men, would make every effort to supply their place with those Irish labourers. The master manufacturers, I am afraid, do not feel that interest in the local prosperity of the country where they live, which is felt by the farmers and agriculturists.

2286. Upon the rise of wages the tendency would be for the master manufacturers to bring in Irish workmen, and the tendency of the Irish population would be to flow in?—I have no doubt of it; for the master manufacturers in Lancashire consider themselves as located there only for a time. I am not speaking of the men of substance, who set out in business with a capital, but of the men who rise from the loom, and, as soon as they can make a small sum of money, build a factory of a certain size, and in the course of a few years accumulate a property, with which they are perhaps content, they then migrate, and their places are supplied by others. Persons of this description do not feel the same interest in questions which relate to the permanent prosperity of the country, as those who are attached to it by the ties of soil.

2287. Are those persons who come over from Ireland as general workmen, persons who are able to fill up the places of the weavers, and engage in that line of business?—Not in general, I should think; but they are able to fill up the places of the power-loom workmen; they would require very little training for part of the work of the power-loom, and so they would stand in the way of the hand-loom weavers being taken up in the power-loom population.

2288. If the hand-loom weavers were once removed, is there no danger of their places being filled up by future importations from Ireland?—I scarcely know the state of the Irish population with respect to weaving; I fancy there are a good many who can weave.

2289. During the period that high wages prevailed in these districts, did the Irish population interfere to any considerable extent with the people of the country?—I believe to a considerable extent with respect to one town (which however I do not mention as an instance of a town connected with the cotton trade) I mean the town of Macclesfield; a great number of Irish settled there; and we have information from Macclesfield, that within the last year, in consequence of the distress, the population has been diminished to the amount of 5,000, of course by removals.

2290. Were those Irish labourers generally employed in the manufactures?—Almost entirely in the manufactures.

2291. Does not your Lordship anticipate that the revival of demand would occasion the erection of power-loom manufactories, both in town and country, which would employ many who are now only hand-loom weavers?—I have no doubt of that; but it would be a work of time.

2292. Is your Lordship aware that the people of Macclesfield about two years ago put public advertisements into the newspapers, that they wanted men?—Yes, they advertised for 5,000 men; but I do not think that the increase of population took place in consequence of that advertisement, it has been a process of some years.

2293. Your Lordship never heard of any other case of an advertisement of that nature?—No.

2294. Knowing the increased facilities of communication between Ireland and England, has your Lordship a doubt that the influx of Irish population has an immediate tendency to reduce the rate of wages in England to the level of the remuneration of labour in Ireland?—It has a tendency, and a direct tendency, although perhaps

3 April,
1827.

perhaps not immediate; time is necessarily required for the process. The Irish labourers do not all at once find their way into the factories, nor are they able all at once to set up looms; but that the tendency exists, and that it has produced very great effects in Lancashire, I am persuaded.

2295. Does not Irish labour always come into competition with agricultural labour in Lancashire and the western parts?—I should think not to any great extent, except in harvest; the great body of Irish labourers who come over in harvest time do not remain in Lancashire or Cheshire, but come on to other parts of the kingdom; they seem rather to prefer the longest tour, for they get the most money by it.

2296. Has your Lordship had an opportunity of seeing who are the labourers employed generally in making the new roads in Lancashire?—That is a matter to which I did not feel myself called upon to pay any attention till lately. Lately, the labourers on the roads have been chiefly Lancashire persons, and they have been paid with the money sent from our Committee; we have however had applications from some places for grants to enable them to relieve persons who have no claim for parochial relief, and we have understood that in many cases they were Irishmen. In the case of Burnley, we had a distinct application for a considerable sum of money, to employ upon the roads persons who had no claim upon the parish. I should apprehend there are from sixty to seventy thousand Irish in the county of Lancaster.

2297. Has your Lordship turned your attention to the subject of Emigration in general, as connected with the condition of the labouring poor in this Kingdom?—I cannot say that I have; it is not within the sphere of my pursuits; it has been only the late distresses in Lancashire which have led me to give any attention to it. I formerly acted for ten years as a magistrate in the agricultural districts, where this question was not forced upon me; but another subject has been forced upon me since I have become acquainted with the manufacturing districts, namely, the enormous disproportion between the wages of the manufacturing and agricultural classes; and it has always occurred to me, that any measure that should tend to something like an equalization of the two, must be beneficial to the country at large. But with respect to the manufacturing districts, I am strongly of opinion that emigration is the most effectual if not the only remedy for the present state of things.

2298. Could your Lordship state to the Committee the great disproportion that appears to you to exist between the two rates of wages?—Yes. In the agricultural districts towards the east of England, for instance, Suffolk, Norfolk, Essex, Cambridgeshire, and in the midland parts Buckinghamshire, it is considered that if a man and his wife and four children, for instance, six in number, can earn ten shillings a week, he has no claim upon the parish for assistance; whereas in the manufacturing districts cases have been brought under the notice of the Relief Committee, as cases of urgent distress, where the same number of persons have been receiving twelve shillings a week.

2299. As a general position, you would think that the rate of wages through the manufacturing districts is much better than the rate of wages through the agricultural districts?—That it was much better.

2300. How should a system of emigration, which related more particularly to the manufacturing population, tend to produce an equalization?—At present the wages of the weavers are much below the wages of the agricultural districts, and should be raised, but not to their former standard. I consider that the manufacturing labourer does, in point of fact, require larger wages than the agricultural labourer, to a certain extent; he is more constantly employed in an unhealthy, irksome employment, and requires bodily comforts of a different description from those which are wanted by the agricultural labourer.

2301. Does your Lordship think that the condition of the labouring poor in some parts of this country is such as to require the serious attention of the legislature?—Certainly.

2302. The Committee may consider that no system of emigration, in your Lordship's view, would be effectual, that did not go to the root of the evil in Ireland?—Not permanently effectual.

2303. At the same time your Lordship is quite disposed to concur in the expenditure which is proposed to be made, for the purpose of removing the temporary and pressing distress at the present moment?—Provided that it be considered

The Lord
Bishop of Chester.

3 April,
1867.

dered as a first experiment, upon the issue of which shall depend the question of establishing a system of emigration; and in that point of view, I consider it would be a cheap experiment.

2304. Does your Lordship think that in the event of some of those weavers being taken to the Canadas, it would be desirable to endeavour by some legislative enactment to make the manufacturers, whose interest it is immediately to fill up their places for the purpose of lowering wages, responsible to the parish, that they shall not bring again an undue population into those parishes?—That is a question which I am unable to answer; but it appears to me so direct an interference with the principles of free trade, that I hardly know how it is to be done. Macclesfield, I believe, is the only case in which there has been a direct public application for labourers from other quarters.

2305. Your Lordship stated, that you thought the manufacturers had not the same interest as the rest of the parish in preventing the distress, to prevent which a sum of money has been voted?—Yes.

2306. Does not your Lordship think it would be fair and equitable to prevent their feeling it their interest to bring about a similar state of things again?—I cannot speak to that.

2307. Is your Lordship aware whether the cottages occupied by this class, half farmers and half weavers, are rated to the owners or the occupiers?—To the occupiers certainly.

2308. Does your Lordship apprehend that a system of rating the owners of those cottages, rather than the occupiers, would be a material check upon the increase of cottages of this description?—I think it would be a very beneficial measure, in almost every imaginable case, that the owner should be rated.

2309. Does your Lordship apprehend the average rate of wages for a series of years has been much larger in the manufacturing than the agricultural districts?—I apprehend so.

2310. Your Lordship has alluded to the condition of persons in the manufacturing and agricultural districts, and you seem to give very much the preference to the average condition of the people in the agricultural districts?—No; I said it would be desirable, if possible, there should be something like an average of the whole; I did not mean to express an opinion as to the sufficiency of the wages in the agricultural districts.

2311. Has, in those districts, the system of saving banks or friendly societies been instituted to any considerable extent, so as to equalize the very fluctuating state of wages in manufacturing districts?—Saving banks have been instituted in the larger towns of the manufacturing districts with good effect; and they have proved, in the late season of distress, a pretty exact criterion of the distress itself, and of the expectations of the people as to the return of trade; but they are not, nor can they well be equally advantageous to the more remote places, for those places in the hills are so far from the large towns, and the people in general have so little information on those subjects, that I am afraid they have not derived much benefit from them. In Manchester and Macclesfield the saving bank has answered the purposes for which it was intended, so far as it has gone.

2312. Do not you consider those institutions as particularly useful in districts where the wages and labour are subject to great fluctuations?—Undoubtedly most useful there; and they would be more useful, if the persons for whose benefit they are intended, availed themselves to the full extent of the advantage; but unfortunately, where the wages are subject to the greatest fluctuations, the people are least disposed to take advantage of such institutions.

2313. Are not the master manufacturers generally a class of persons caring but little for the comforts and condition of the labourers?—I cannot say so much as that; the more respectable of the master manufacturers are, I think, an extremely humane body of men; I have seen, in many cases, the greatest interest evinced in the welfare, both bodily and spiritual, of their workmen. There is a class of manufacturers who care for nothing, but how they may make the greatest sum of money in the least time. No two descriptions of men can be more different than those whom I should call the respectable manufacturers, and the sort of middling class, between them and the operative weavers.

2314. Is not the least respectable class a very considerable proportion of the whole?—Very considerable in point of numbers.

2315. In times of good demand for manufactures in the districts to which you allude,

allude, is there not always a great influx of Irish into those districts?—I can hardly say how that is; I have understood it to be so.

2316. During the late period of distress, in visiting those districts, has your Lordship found that persons, through that country, have been in the greatest state of destitution?—It was impossible, under the circumstances of my visit to those districts, that I could make that minute inquiry into the cases of individual distress, which would enable me to give a distinct answer to that question: At the time I visited Lancashire, I should say there were scarcely any persons in a state of extreme destitution; shortly afterwards, from some cause which I have never been able quite to discover, there was a sudden and very great increase of distress, though we were informed at the time, there was more work than there had been for the preceding ten months; the fact seems to be, that during that ten months they had borne up as well as they could, but that their means of converting their little property into money were then utterly exhausted, and they fell into a state of extreme destitution.

2317. What were the instances in which your Lordship observed the distress to be most serious?—The neighbourhood of Burnley, the district called Pendle Forest, and the townships of Blackburn.

2318. Has your Lordship any information to communicate to the Committee, which may be of use to them in the inquiry they are prosecuting?—My inquiries probably have been directed to a different object than that which the Committee have in view; my inquiries were at that time principally directed to the moral condition of the people, which I confess appeared to me to be considerably better than I had always been told that it was; the hand-loom weavers are a very orderly and, generally speaking, a well-disposed body of men; they manifest a great readiness to listen to good advice, and, from some personal inquiries amongst the poor, I am led to hope that a considerable moral improvement has taken place in many of them, in consequence of their sufferings. I may add to a former remark which I made, the disproportion between the wages paid in manufacturing and agricultural districts will appear still greater, if we take into account the different prices of some of the necessities of life in the respective districts; for instance, fuel, which is as important to the health of the labouring population as the quality of their food, is not more than one-third or one-fourth of the price in the manufacturing districts which it costs in the eastern counties; clothing, generally speaking, not more than two thirds. The only article in which their expenses are necessarily greater, is that of house-rent; a cottage, which in the agricultural districts would let for not more than three pounds a year, in the manufacturing districts fetches eight pounds.

2319. Does your Lordship think that this low rate of wages in the agricultural districts is referable to the population being disproportionate to the demand for labour?—No; I think it chiefly attributable to the operation of the Poor Laws. Under the present administration of the Poor Laws, even a deficient population may become burthensome to the parish as well as a redundant, although of course not to the same extent.

2320. How could a deficient population, that is to say, a population not sufficient for the demand for labour, be otherwise than sufficiently remunerated to keep them off the parish?—Because there will always be a certain number of persons who will be glad to find some pretence for not working, and will prefer having seven shillings without work, to having ten shillings with work; and while there is a parish fund to be depended on, the farmers will systematically pay low wages, and have the deficiency made up out of the rates, to which others contribute as well as themselves; this, at least, is according to my own experience.

2321. Your Lordship first knew the manufacturing district of Lancashire in a season of prosperity?—Rather at the termination of it.

2322. Were you struck with any difference in the expenses and habits of the manufacturing labourer at that time, as contrasted with the habits of the agricultural labourer at that time?—My knowledge of that period is, properly speaking, historical, for I did not go into the diocese of Chester until the year 1824, and I had not much opportunity of inquiring into the habits of the people until 1825, when the distress was beginning; but from the accounts I have received, I should say that the habits of the manufacturing classes are those of improvidence, compared with the agricultural.

The Lord
Bishop of Chester.

3 April,
1827.

William Henley Hyett, Esq. called in; and Examined.

*William H. Hyett,
Esq.*

3 April,
1847.

2323. YOU are Secretary of the Committee for the Relief of distressed Manufacturers—I am.

2324. Will you state your opinion as to the extent of the distress among the manufacturers in the county of Renfrew and county of Lanark in Scotland?—There has existed very considerable distress in both those places, particularly in Paisley.

2325. Have you any details to offer to the Committee upon that subject?—I have no documents with me, but I can from the Committee room furnish the information, if it is desired.

2326. Do you believe it to have been very excessive?—The manufacturing classes have suffered very excessively from the loss of trade.

2327. Have there been, in your judgment, any great exertions in Glasgow and Paisley, among the better part of the inhabitants there, for the relief of those distressed?—At Glasgow and Paisley the exertions have been very great by individuals; subscriptions by the gentlemen of the country, and other local efforts, have been made in aid of the distressed.

2328. Have you observed, in the course of the correspondence which you have carried on with various individuals in Lancashire, in Yorkshire, and in Scotland, any particular circumstances relative to hand-loom weaving, which have induced you to form any opinion as to the declining state of that branch of manufacture?—The hand-loom weavers in general are at this moment out of employment, not being able to compete with the power-loom.

2329. Will you explain to the Committee your opinions as to hand-loom weaving, what part of it, in your judgment, must inevitably decline, and what part of it, in your judgment, will probably continue for some time longer, until in short the power-loom machines are much improved?—The hand-loom weavers of calicoes are those that are thrown out of employment at this moment, those who fabricate muslins and fancy goods still continue to get employment.

2330. Did you ever hear that those individuals, being hand-loom weavers, who manufacture what is called figured work, are not in much danger of losing their occupations?—They are not at this moment.

2331. Even when that figured work is upon somewhat coarse goods?—It is very difficult for the power-loom to imitate the figured work, therefore it will remain in the hands of the hand-loom weavers for some time to come.

2332. It is then that description of hand-loom weavers who are employed in plain calicoes who may expect to have their labour extinguished by the power-loom?—Yes, those are precisely the persons.

2333. Is it your opinion that it would be impossible for the power-loom weavers to do the figured work?—At present they have not attempted to do it; as to what improvements may take place, it is impossible to say.

2334. Do not you understand that great improvements in the construction of power-loom have taken place in the silk manufacture, and that in the silk manufactures they are enabled to weave figured goods?—Yes, I do; but it has not yet been applied, I believe, to muslins.

2335. Have you any information that you can give to the Committee as to the number of persons out of employment in Lancashire?—I can furnish the exact number from documents we have at the Manufacturers Relief Committee, the number out of employ in any part of the district.

2336. When you say, persons out of employment, are they not generally persons having some employment, but not sufficient employment to provide means of subsistence?—I should perhaps designate as applicants for relief, rather, than persons out of employment. There are very few weavers out of employment absolutely at this moment, but the wages that they derive are not adequate to their support.

2337. Is not that inadequacy of their wages owing to there being a greater number than there is work for?—Certainly.

2338. Can you state, upon the average of the whole population, the deficiency of employment?—If we take, for instance, the hundred of Blackburn, where I believe the hand-loom weavers are principally living, out of a population of 150,000, the return sent to us was, that there were about 90,000 last year stated to be out of employment;

employment; those persons have since found employment, generally, but at very low wages.

2339. According to the latest account you have, what is your belief as to the deficiency of the employment?—The deficiency is rather more in the wages than the employment; the weavers are called upon to work from twelve to fourteen hours a day, the average earnings per week of the individuals would be from 4s. to 5s. 6d.

2340. What evidence have you of such an immense number as 95,000 having been out of employment at the period you speak to?—We have the returns from each of the parishes; I have before me a Return of the hundred of Blackburn, made last year, in which there are the number of inhabitants in want of employment.

2341. When you say "out of employment," explain to the Committee what you mean?—At the period the report was made, they had not the means of employment.

2342. Do you mean that they have partial employment?—It may be said that they had employment one or two days in the week. The Return to the committee stated, first, the "population of the parish," and then the "persons out of employment."

[The Witness delivered in Abstracts of the Population Returns from the distressed districts; which were read, and are as follow:]

LANCASHIRE.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	DESCRIPTION.	Classes totally out of work.		REMARKS.
				Parish.	Strangers.	
1846.						
Dec. -	Blackburn - - -	53,500	weaving and spinning	7,542	3,040	This is one division of the Hundred of Blackburn.
	Over Darwen - - -					
	Lower Darwen - - -					
	Accrington - - -					
	Altham and Clayton - - -					
	Billington - - -					
	Balderton - - -					
	Great Harwood - - -					
	Eccleshill - - -					
	Melton - - -					
	Milton - - -					
	Hoghton Town - - -					
	Ribblesdale and Altham - - -					
	Walton-le-dale - - -					
	Altham Bailly - - -	6,000	- - - -	1,300		
	Rossington - - -					
	Rabton - - -					
	Churchkirk - - -					
	Oswaldtwistle - - -					
November and December.	Hawthorn - - -	46,305	D ^r - - -	4,040		
	Newchurch - - -					
	Coepe Leuch - - -					
	Niddulley - - -					
	Hall Carr - - -					
	Martley - - -					
	Herbottle - - -					
Aug. 21.	Lower Booth - - -	8,557	half woollen, half cotton	not many.		Work done is cotton, but not in woollen.
	Barrow - - -					
	Edensfield - - -					
	Hilcombe - - -					
	Littleboro' - - -					
	Newchurch Rossendale - - -	13,453	(weavers of cotton & woollen - - -)	3 to 400		Distress much shared.
May -	Rochdale - - -					
1847.						
Feb. -	Bury - - -	10,583	D ^r - - -	500		Work, but at low wages.
	Hwywood - - -					
Nov. and Dec. 1846.	Middleton - - -	20,879	- - - -	1,180	140	
	Chaderton - - -					
	Ainsworth - - -					

LANCASHIRE—continued.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	DESCRIPTION.	Claimants totally out of work.		REMARKS.
				Parish.	Strangers.	
1846.						
December	Oldham - - -	25,000	weavers of cotton and woollen.	-	-	one-half out of work, besides paupers.
	St John Lees - -	-	-	-	-	Very distressed.
	Tadcaster - - -	12,800	-	-	-	
	Shaw - - -	-	-	-	350	
	Saddsworth - - -	15,000	- D* - d*	3,400,	-	of whom one-half are Irish.
November	Colne - - -	19,000				
	Pendle Wharf - -	-				
	Reed Waddington -	-				
	Waddington - - -	-				
	Grindleton - - -	-				
	Newchurch - - -	-				
	Whalley - - -	-				
	Belton - - -	15,530	weaving and spinning cotton.	-	-	
	Symington - - -	-	-	642	300	
	Helyhouse - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Pudham - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Higham - - -	-	-	-	-	
November and December	Barley - - -	7,407	weaving and spinning	-	-	
	Haberghwaite - -	-	-	-	-	
	Chigger - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Worsley - - -	9,376	- D* - d*	-	-	
	Baccliffe - - -	-	-	-	-	
November	Chorley - - -	-				
May	including	-				
	Standish - - -	-				
	Clayton - - -	-				
	Bratherton - - -	-				
	Wrightington - -	-				
	Cremsey - - -	-				
	Howick - - -	-				
	Loughton - - -	-				
	Parswortham - -	-				
	Whittle - - -	38,007	weavers and spinners of cotton.	-	-	less than last year, weaving, 40 per cent, spinning, 20 d.
	Hutton - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Hespy - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Wharfedale - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Hoole - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Farington - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Cuerdick - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Layland - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Beckersall - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Belton-de Moors, and its 20 Townships - -	50,000	weaving and spinning of cotton.	-	-	[* Figures not received.]
	Dean and Townships -	18,506	-	-	-	
November and December	Tilley - - -	-	-	33	77	greatly distressed.
	Little Hulton - -	-	-	none	-	
	Bedford - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Ashtley - - -	-	-	-	-	
	Adlington - - -	11,678	- d* - d*	-	-	
	Lough - - -	-	-	50	-	
	Pennington - - -	-	-	few	300	
	Worsley - - -	8,000				
	Reels - - -	53,330				

W. H. Hyatt, Secretary.

YORKSHIRE.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	DESCRIPTION.	Children totally out of work		REMARKS.
				Paupers.	Strangers.	
1825:						
Dec. 2.	Alverthorpe - - -	4,854	Weavers - - -	143	153	
13.	Bradford - - -	42,200	D ^r - - -	—	—	
1.	Barnsley - - -	8,300	D ^r - - -	330	130	
	Butley - - -	3,217	D ^r - - -	260	—	
June	Balden and Gaisley -	5,153	D ^r - - -	682	—	
	Bernal - - -	5,840	D ^r - - -	50	—	
13.	Beckindale - - -	—	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Cross Stone - - -	10,170	D ^r - - -	200	—	
	Cumbarworth - - -	1,130	D ^r - - -	45	51	
	Clockhutton - - -	4,000	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Darton - - -	1,340	D ^r - - -	35	40	
	Deasly - - -	1,142	D ^r - - -	100	7	
	Dewsbury - - -	7,500	D ^r - - -	50	50	
	Dodsworth - - -	1,322	D ^r - - -	37	72	
	Earls Hutton - - -	3,600	D ^r - - -	180	—	
	Elland - - -	6,000	D ^r - - -	200	—	
	Heptonstall - - -	4,530	D ^r - - -	67	66	
Nov.	Huddersfield - - -	15,000	D ^r - - -	910	80	
	Galcar - - -	2,500	D ^r - - -	200	60	
	Scotswode - - -	855	D ^r - - -	127	40	
	Staincliffe - - -	2,871	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Farnley Tynes - - -	900	D ^r - - -	75	34	
	Hesley - - -	4,000	D ^r - - -	551	50	
25.	Almondbury - - -	2,077	D ^r - - -	339	271	
	Kirkstall - - -	2,180	D ^r - - -	545	255	
	Dalton - - -	2,089	D ^r - - -	200	200	
	Lupton - - -	2,722	D ^r - - -	140	80	
	Longwood - - -	1,041	D ^r - - -	124	162	
	Kirkstall - - -	2,132	D ^r - - -	192	59	
	Shepley - - -	1,000	D ^r - - -	51	21	
	Shelf - - -	1,379	D ^r - - -	110	116	
	Woodside - - -	2,500	D ^r - - -	303	55	
	Tharston - - -	889	D ^r - - -	83	25	
	Lackwood - - -	2,600	D ^r - - -	270	200	
	Leeds - - -	2,127	D ^r - - -	127	133	
	Linky - - -	2,040	D ^r - - -	62	84	
23.	High Hayland - - -	268	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Swine D ^r - - -	735	D ^r - - -	55	17	
Dec. 5.	Hepportholme - - -	3,063	D ^r - - -	—	—	
Nov. 25.	Haworth - - -	4,658	D ^r - - -	620	20	
	Hutton - - -	1,300	D ^r - - -	90	—	
	Yeadon - - -	2,789	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Hocknoldscliffe - - -	2,700	D ^r - - -	70	59	
	Kelighley - - -	—	D ^r - - -	—	—	
	Kearnsdale - - -	7,000	D ^r - - -	50	100	
	Liversedge - - -	4,560	D ^r - - -	200	—	
23.	Midgley - - -	1,400	D ^r - - -	169	—	
	Norland - - -	1,800	D ^r - - -	38	67	
1827:						
Feb.	Oswest - - -	2,000	D ^r - - -	420	—	
	Pennistone - - -	545	D ^r - - -	16	17	
	Sowerby - - -	2,000	D ^r - - -	—	80	
Nov.	Stainland - - -	2,009	D ^r - - -	25	24	
Dec.	Southdun - - -	2,100	D ^r - - -	115	28	
	Stelmorsham - - -	700	D ^r - - -	—	—	
Jan. 11.	Stanley - - -	2,700	D ^r - - -	200	—	
Nov. 24.	Therston - - -	4,850	D ^r - - -	500	—	
29.	Warley - - -	2,000	D ^r - - -	238	272	
Feb. 10.	Wenshoro' - - -	1,000	D ^r - - -	400	—	

W. H. Hyatt, Secretary.

WILTSHIRE.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	DESCRIPTION.	Chambers totally out of work.		REMARKS.
				Parochial.	Strangers.	
1895:						
Nov. 21.	Bradford - - -	15,000	Weavers - - -	1,638	200	
	Marlborough - - -	1,380	D ^r - - -	140	50	
	Hilperton - - -	1,023	D ^r - - -	278	62	
Nov. 17.	Melksham - - -	5,090	D ^r - - -	200	—	
Feb. 24.	Maiden Bradley - - -	640	D ^r - - -	104	20	
Nov. -	North Bradley - - -	2,473	D ^r - - -	652	128	
25.	Trowbridge - - -	11,000	D ^r - - -	-	-	A great number employed on roads. This place is in great distress.

W. H. Hyett, Secretary.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	DESCRIPTION.	Chambers totally out of work.		REMARKS.
				Parochial.	Strangers.	
1895:						
Dec. -	Bisley - - -	6,000	weavers of broad cloth	2,000		
	Dursley and townships	7,500	D ^r and card making	50	50	
	Kingswood, Wilts -	1,500	woollen spinning -	200		
	Palmerwick - about	5,000	weaving cloth -	270		
	Stroud - - -	8,012	dyeing and finishing cloth	cannot be ascertained, but very considerable.		
	Uley - - -	3,000	broad-cloth weaving	210		
	Wootton-under-edge -	6,000	D ^r - D ^r -	300		
1897:						
Feb. -	North Nibley - - -	4,860	- - - -	1,226	150	
	Cass - - -		- - - -			
	Coaley - - -		- - - -			

W. H. Hyett, Secretary.

SCOTLAND.

Date of Return.	PLACE.	Population.	Out of Employ.	REMARKS.
1897:				
Mar. 20.	Edinburgh - - -	138,235	1,600	adults, at the time the report was made last year. The condition of the poor is now much worse.
29.	Paisley - - -	72,334	235	families on the Charity fund, 31st March 1897.
Jan. 2.	Perth - - -	12,068	1,600	
Feb. 2.	Pellechaw - - -	2,000	127	adults.
Mar. 17.	Kilbryth - - -	4,250	146	D ^r .

W. H. Hyett, Secretary.

William H. Hyatt,
Esq.

3 April,
1837.

2343. Is it not your opinion that although the distress must undoubtedly have been very great, yet as the application to the London Committee was always for relief, the persons applying, like all persons applying for relief, have a natural disposition rather to overstate their case?—In some instances, perhaps, but generally speaking, it was so well guarded, that the returns called for may be relied on; they were made by local committees which were established in different parts of the country, and it was required that the statements should be vouched for by the chairman of the committee or clergyman of the parish, and also a neighbouring magistrate, who must in some measure have been enabled to judge of the accuracy of the statements.

2344. Have not the landed proprietors of the country an interest in relieving their poor rates, by obtaining as much relief as possible from London?—I do not think, generally speaking, those documents have been from the landed proprietors, they emanated from the clergy and from the master manufacturers, from the local committees, generally speaking.

2345. Have not the Committee at the London Tavern been particularly jealous with regard to observations and applications made by overseers and churchwardens?—Always; and further inquiries, as to accuracy of the returns made by overseers, have been always instituted before relief was granted.

2346. Have they not generally viewed them with great suspicion?—They have.

2347. Do you recollect whether on all occasions, whenever the Bishop of Chester was present, the committee have not applied to him to know the character of the clergyman of the distressed place, who signed any return of the distress?—Yes.

2348. Have they not regulated their conduct by his Lordship's answers?—In a great measure.

2349. Have you a statement of the employed and unemployed in the different townships?—I have delivered in the Statements required.

2350. Will you have the goodness to state generally the proceedings of the Manufacturers Relief Committee, of the present state of distress, as it appears before them, and your own views upon the subject?—The course proceeded in by the Committee, which was formed after the public meeting in May 1826, was, in the first instance, to make liberal remittances to the suffering districts; and having provided against the extravagance, they formed local committees in every place applying for aid; to these bodies sets of queries as to the amount of population, resources, poor rates, and actual condition, were sent, the accuracy of the return being vouched for by a neighbouring magistrate; the rate of aid afterwards furnished was regulated by these documents, which in districts where the distress continued, were renewed from time to time, so that the existing state of the place was always before the committee. When the danger of starvation was removed, the Committee, aware of the ill effects produced by gratuitous assistance, directed that out-door labour should be expected from all able-bodied persons applying for relief. This measure had the double effect, of preventing parties who could obtain other employment from participating in the charity fund, and also of removing a number of weavers from the loom altogether, leaving to those that remained a greater portion of employment. Wherever any party or undertaking was benefited by the work performed by the individuals under the care of the committee, a contribution according to circumstances was expected; in general the arrangement was two-thirds of the amount expended in manual labour, to be furnished by such party or undertaking, and one-third by the committee. At the commencement of the winter, distributions were made of articles of clothing and bedding, (many persons having sold or pawned theirs at the pressure of the moment,) and in some cases where the distress was most severe, provisions were again supplied; as the rigour of the season abated, this gratuitous assistance was discontinued; but grants for labour, down to the present moment, have been periodically made to the parts of the country still suffering under distress. The districts that continue to claim the attention of the Manufacturers Relief Committee are, Paisley and some other parts of Scotland, (where however the condition of the people is much improved;) Pendle Forest, and the hundred of Blackburn generally; some other parts of Lancashire; the district round Huddersfield, the neighbourhood of Leeds, and some other parts of Yorkshire; portions of Wiltshire, Gloucester, and Somersetshire; also the Staffordshire Potteries. In the woollen districts the distress has rather increased of late; and the fancy

William H. Ryett,

Esq.

3 April,
1857.

walstroat trade, about Huddersfield, has not made the improvement which it was expected the spring would produce. These are but temporary bars, that will eventually be removed, and employment will again ensue; but to the hand-loom weavers of Lancashire, Paisley, and some other places, no lapse of time can possibly bring back their usual occupations; the rate of wages they must be confined to, in order to compete with the power-looms, will not suffice for their proper maintenance; indeed the only cause of their finding employment at present is, that either the poor rate or the funds of the Relief Committee contribute towards their support, and in fact pay a portion of the wages of the master manufacturer, which circumstance induces him to give out work that otherwise would not at this period be wrought, or would be performed by the power-looms, which produces cloth of rather a superior quality. In this district but scanty aid can now be derived from the poor rate, the lay payers having themselves become generally paupers, and the diminution of the funds of the committee will gradually put an end to that resource; the condition of the hand-loom weavers must therefore be very deplorable, unless some means are devised for procuring them such occupation as may enable them to earn a subsistence. It appears that a portion of the calico weavers may, by a small alteration of the loom, turn to weaving muslins and fancy goods; but this can only be to a small extent; and they must, by this means, either reduce the wages, or dispossess some of the persons at present occupied in this branch of manufacture. The case of these persons, therefore, claims the attention and sympathy of the country.

2351. Do you not consider the surplus population arising from that portion of labour which is deprived of work by the introduction of power-looms, that part for which there is no chance of any improvement hereafter?—Certainly; those hand-loom weavers have very little chance of ever finding employment again, especially those who are resident in the distant townships; those in large towns will in the course of time find partial work. I found on inquiry a sort of loom had been lately invented, by which hand-weavers can in some measure compete with the power-loom. These looms possess some little improvement on the common loom; but they do not exist to any great extent, nor can they, I believe, compete successfully with the power-loom.

2352. Within how short a time do you think the Manufacturers Relief Committee, by their local correspondence, could obtain a list of persons, from the manufacturing districts of Lancashire, willing to engage in an immediate plan of emigration?—Within a very short period; some of our local committees will answer instantly, others will take more time; within a fortnight or three weeks, I should think.

2353. Were you not sent into Lancashire by the Committee?—Yes, at three periods.

2354. Did you travel about that country for the purpose of obtaining information?—Yes.

2355. Were you in the company of gentlemen likely to give you good information?—Frequently in the company of persons able to give information on the subjects interesting to the Committee.

2356. Who accompanied you?—Mr. M'Adam, in the last tour I made through the country.

2357. How long were you in the country?—Three weeks or more, the first time; about the same period the second, and a month making the last tour.

2358. Did not you obtain a great deal of information, which you afterwards gave to the Committee?—Yes, on my return I made reports regularly to the Committee.

2359. These were the basis, in a degree, for future proceedings of the Committee?—In a great measure.

2360. The committees which you acted with in the country, in co-operation with the London Committee, have done their duty very well?—They have, very efficiently.

2361. Would they not be the best means through which either any plan of emigration, or any plan of relief, could be devised?—They would obtain the desired information for us, I have no doubt, instantly.

2362. The Committee in London have had every reason to be satisfied with their co-operation?—Perfectly so.

2363. Did you, when you were in the country, ever hear any anxiety expressed upon the subject of emigration?—Not in the country; but since I returned from the

William H. Hyatt,
Esq.

3 April,
1827.

the country we have had communications; within a few days I had had an interview with a gentleman, who stated there were fifty families in his neighbourhood, who were wishing for the means of emigrating.

2364. Did you not find in the townships you visited, intelligent men who had formed themselves into committees, for the purpose of investigating the wants of the poor and providing relief?—I met with many, intelligent and active, most anxious to render their assistance.

2365. Do you not conceive that the parishes, merely from calculation of their interests, would be disposed to contribute towards affording the means of emigration to many of the poor?—I should think it very likely that they would, for we have made terms with parishes where we employed persons on the road, by which they readily agreed to furnish a certain quota of the men's wages in aid of our fund.

2366. Can you state to the Committee what an unemployed family, a man, his wife, and three children, costs a parish in Lancashire?—Eighteen pence per head per week, one with the other, is a usual allowance.

2367. If the sanction of Parliament were obtained for the removal of twelve or thirteen hundred families from different districts to which you have alluded, do you conceive the committees in the country connected with the Relief Committee would have any difficulty in making the necessary selection?—I think the subject is not sufficiently known in the country; the local committees would have the means of making the wishes of this Committee known, and of selecting proper persons.

2368. Do you wish to be understood, that emigration is not a subject at present sufficiently considered, to enable the London Committee to act?—My answer referred to the information possessed at present by the persons in the country.

2369. Though the subject may not be sufficiently understood to induce all those who, under a better understanding, might be ready to go, still do you think that the London Committee would have any difficulty in selecting a sufficient number of objects upon whom the money might be expended?—I think not, through the channel I have named; the hand-loom weavers are still in the greatest distress; and I presume there would be very little difficulty in getting a sufficient number of persons to go from certain places, without loss of time. I would name distant parishes as the proper places, rather than large towns, where the population, if removed, are in some degree helpless; but in country hamlets they are partly insured to agricultural labour, the weavers being also occupiers of land.

2370. What do you think would be the effect upon the present state of that part of the country, of removing twelve or thirteen hundred families?—By lessening the competition, there would be more labour for those who remain, and better wages would of course be obtained; the condition of both would be very considerably bettered, as those removed would be also provided for. The parishes would also benefit by this measure, as the poor rates would also be materially diminished.

2371. Do you apprehend, in the present state of employment of those districts, such a removal would tend to restore a sufficiency of employment to the persons who remain?—It would ameliorate the condition of many distressed manufacturers.

2372. You speak from your knowledge of the present state of the district?—I do.

2373. Upon your estimate of eighteen pence a head, a family of five persons out of employment would cost the parish somewhere about twenty pounds a year; do not you think that any parish would pay one year's expense of such a family, to get rid of them altogether?—It would certainly be their interest to do so.

2374. Would certainly be their interest to get rid of an incumbrance at one year's purchase!—I apprehend they would see such an advantage.

2375. Have you reason to believe that there were a great number of Irish settled in the counties of Lanark and Renfrewshire?—I cannot answer that question precisely; the number of Irish in the manufacturing districts of England I could give, but not in Scotland; we have not a return from Scotland, of the number of Irish settled there.

2376. You have been in some of the manufacturing districts of England?—Yes, but not in Scotland.

2377. Does it occur to you that there might be any means of preventing such an accumulation of population in that district?—Removing them seems to be the most obvious remedy.

William H. Byatt,
Esq.

3 April,
1867

2378. Is not the expense of removal so great sometimes, as to make it rather a matter of expediency to endeavour to support them?—A question as to the expediency of removing the Irish from some parts of Lancashire, came before the Relief Committee; the first intention of the landowners was to get rid of the superabundant population, but in consequence of the expense incurred, and the distress which would be consequent upon that measure, we made a stipulation that they should be relieved on the spot, and their removal not attempted for the present.

2379. In consequence of this wish, they were not removed?—They were not; we wished them to remain, in the hope that the trade would revive, and, the manufacturers being still on the spot, business might commence without loss of time.

2380. Do you think it would be an easy matter to select proper persons from those wishing to emigrate; would not the parishes be desirous of getting rid of those least capable of supporting themselves by their own labour?—I am not sufficiently informed on the subject, but that appears likely to be the wish they would form.

Captain Henry William Scott, R. N. called in; and Examined.

2381. YOU are in the Royal Navy?—I am.

2382. Have you resided any time in Nova Scotia?—About seven or eight years.

2383. In what situation were you there?—I was living there as a private gentleman since the peace, but occasionally employed as a surveyor; I was Assistant Surveyor General of the province, a part of the time.

2384. You assisted in the surveying a part of the crown lands in Nova Scotia?—I did.

2385. Can you state to the Committee whether there is at present any considerable quantity of crown lands in Nova Scotia, fit for settlements?—I cannot state the quantity, but I can state pretty confidently that there is a large quantity in Nova Scotia. I have not been there these three years; but about three or four years ago, I surveyed through an extensive district of land, which I should imagine can be settled to a very great extent.

2386. At what distance from the sea?—Not far from the sea, on the sea coast.

2387. With easy communications?—Yes.

2388. And good land?—Yes, very good land.

2389. What do you mean by a large district, to what extent?—An hundred miles in length, by probably ten or twelve in width in one direction, and ten in another perhaps.

2390. For what purposes were they surveyed by government?—I was employed by Lord Dalhousie, and afterwards Sir James Kemp, who is Governor now, in dividing the provinces into counties and townships; and in doing that I was also commanded to lay out divisions, for the purpose of locating emigrants upon those lands.

2391. Have any portion of those lands been since located?—Yes, one very large settlement has been formed, called the Dalhousie Settlement, which has turned out very well indeed.

2392. Upon what terms were they located?—They had to furnish money for paying for the grants. They furnished their own funds.

2393. They were voluntary emigrants?—Yes.

2394. From Scotland, or from England?—Principally from Scotland. There was nothing furnished to them upon those settlements, they came out with a little property.

2395. Were they charged with any fees upon the land?—Yes.

2396. Can you state to what amount?—For an hundred acres, I think the fees in the cheapest way, (for there were two ways of doing it,) if a man took out his grant for an hundred acres, he paid possibly more than joining with others perhaps in the usual way; five or six pounds would be the expense of obtaining a grant of an hundred acres of land; there is the surveying of it, together with the fees of office.

2397. Is there any reservation of quit-rent?—No, none in Nova Scotia.

2398. As soon as the land was surveyed the grant was given in fee-simple?—Yes, liable to escheat on the noncompliance with the terms of the grant, which are, that in a given time certain proportions of the whole must be cultivated.

2399. What

Capt.
Henry W. Scott,
R. N.

3 April,
1827.

2399. What number of acres did each settler get?—Generally about an hundred; I think it has been lessened of late years. They used to give 500 acres, ten or twelve years ago.

2400. Are they settled close to each other?—There is generally an intermission, not at all close, that was never studied, it was never made a matter of study; a road was generally made in the first instance on a line of country, and roads led off on each side of it.

2401. Would it not very much add to the comfort and convenience of the settlers, that their settlements should be contiguous, that there should not be an intermission of the settlements?—There abodes were generally contiguous; the hundred acres of the one abutted on the other.

2402. When were those settlements made?—About seven or eight years ago.

2403. In what condition are the individuals now?—Report speaks fairly; I have not been to see them myself at those settlements.

2404. You have not heard any complaints of their situation?—No.

2405. Supposing they had made any agreement for repayment, would they be at present in a condition to pay any thing?—I have no doubt of it, because I know instances, not with regard to public lands, but to the sale of private lands, in which the settler has been enabled to pay a rent easily, after five or six years, without any difficulty.

2406. What time do you think they could pay, without material inconvenience?—It depends so much on the nature of the soil and facility to market, and other things, I can hardly state the particular time. I can state an instance of a settler, who came out without a farthing, going on a piece of private land belonging to a friend of mine, for which he was to pay five pounds for an hundred acres, but he did not. The owner of the land held the grant till he should pay this sum of money, as he could have paid it easily in the third year; it was the purchase of an hundred acres. The owner of the land had, in the eastern part of the province, a considerable district, and he laid it out in hundred-acre lots, payable in a given time. And I know another instance of one of those persons who was remiss in making his payment, and the owner of the land determined on seizing on the property after six years; the man did not pay in six years; but when he came to value the property for which the man was to pay, it was valued at 500*l.* on the hundred acres.

2407. At how much did he originally sell the 100 acres?—Five pounds; it was probably worth more, for it was in a very fine part of the province; and the owner of the land looked to his reserve; he sold out part of the land, and the remuneration he looked to was from the increased value of the reserves in the intermediate 100 acres. These reserved lots are now turning out to be very valuable.

2408. What is considered in that country the average price of land per acre undeared?—It scarcely has any general price affixed to it; the value of the grant, and the expense attending it and getting it clear, regulate the price.

2409. Do you understand that in Nova Scotia, any person asking for a grant and paying the fees, and promising to comply with the terms of the settlement, can get a grant of land from government?—Yes, certainly.

2410. Any number of persons, on going out from England, on applying to the Governor in Nova Scotia, could get located on the land?—Yes, on the payment of the fees.

2411. To any given extent, as to number?—Yes, I should imagine so, to the extent of ungranted land; there is no other limitation as to number, provided they are British subjects.

2412. Is there any limitation as to the means of providing them with good lands?—None, except those mentioned; and there are very large districts of unappropriated land in Nova Scotia.

2413. Can you state how many have been so located within the last few years?—No, I cannot.

2414. Have as many as one thousand or two thousand been located?—I cannot say.

2415. Where do they generally land?—At Halifax.

2416. How far have they to go to reach their lands?—Some an hundred or an hundred and twenty miles, if they go to Pictou; that is another point for their landing; it is in the entrance of the Gulf of Saint Lawrence.

Capt.
Henry W. Scott,
a. s.

3 April,
1827.

2417. Of how many people does the Dalhousie settlement consist?—The first settlement was about three hundred, but they have increased very wonderfully since by their own natural increase.

2418. Has there been further emigration there?—Yes, there has been, I cannot state the extent of it. They were principally Scotch, and as soon as they found themselves comfortably there, they added to their number by inducing their friends in Scotland to come out to them.

2419. What class of persons were they?—Labouring farmers, but there were some weavers among them.

2420. Do you know from what part of Scotland they came?—I do not.

2421. Can you give the Committee any idea of the value of one hundred acres of land in Nova Scotia, at the expiration of five years labour employed upon it, taking it to be in a good situation?—I should certainly say 100 *l.* at the very least.

2422. You would consider a hundred acres, after five years labour, as a sufficient security for 3*l.* a year?—Most undoubtedly.

2423. Would 3*l.* a year be obtained from one hundred acres of land with greater facility, if it were taken in produce than in money?—Yes, I think it would.

2424. Do you think that a settler, having been five years upon a hundred acres of land in Nova Scotia, in an ordinary case, would have any difficulty in paying annually 3*l.* worth of produce, if he were allowed to redeem his land at twenty years purchase?—I think there would be no difficulty at all.

2425. Do you think that those are terms which would be willingly submitted to by settlers, which could be easily enforced, and for the enforcement of which the land would be a sufficient security?—Yes.

2426. How much land could a good settler, with a family, clear in a year?—The European settler could scarcely clear his land at all; the quantity of land they could clear would greatly depend upon their funds. An English labourer, going out to America, is as helpless as a child in the woods, in comparison with the old settler; he is obliged to employ the labourers of the country to clear it for him; his ability therefore would depend upon his capability to hire the people of the country to do it.

2427. When you say that a hundred acres, after five years possession, would be worth 100 *l.*, you mean, that the person so settled must pay during that time a considerable sum for the labour of persons in the country?—I think that after having hired people for the purpose of clearing two or three acres, which would be sufficient for two years, by the expiration of two years he would himself become an axe man, for that is the great difficulty, and then that would render unnecessary any further hiring for the purpose of clearing more land; it is merely at the beginning he would find it necessary to hire.

2428. At what period of the year was this Dalhousie settlement formed?—In the autumn.

2429. How did they provide themselves with food for the first few months?—They purchased it at a cheap rate.

2430. What amount of money do you suppose they took with them, on the average?—I cannot positively state that.

2431. Do you think they had 10*l.* a piece?—Yes, certainly.

2432. Twenty?—It is a sort of guess; they came out with a very small sum, and they lived on fish and oatmeal, which are bought cheap.

2433. You think they had more than 10*l.* a piece, when they came out?—I think it most probable they had.

2434. Could they always have persons to assist them in clearing the land?—Yes, always.

2435. If a great number went out at once, would they not find a difficulty?—I think not, labourers come from the States.

2436. Do you know the state of the land prepared for the reception of the emigrants?—It is covered with large timber.

2437. From your general knowledge of emigration, will you state how you think a body of two or three thousand weavers from England or Scotland, carried over to Nova Scotia, would be able to make their living?—I should not imagine that the habits of weavers would fit them very well for an agricultural people.

2438. What growth of timber is upon this land?—A mixture of beech, hick, maple, cypress, and pine.

2439. They

Capt.
Henry W. Scott,
R. N.

2 April,
1827.

2439. They are maple and beech lands, are they not; not oak?—There is very little oak; there is one district of oak, which is a very thriving settlement indeed.

2440. Do not you consider the oak lands the best for settlements?—No; we think the mixed wood best for settlers, where there is a mixture of what they call in that country, hard and soft wood; where there is a mixture of the pine and beech with the others.

2441. Immediate clearing is more difficult for the earlier settlers where there is a mixture, is it not?—No; there is not much difference, I think, in the expense of clearing.

2442. Do you know any thing of New Brunswick?—A little; I have been living there two years.

2443. Have you been up the river St. John?—I have.

2444. Is there much unsettled land in that province?—A great deal, very large tracts indeed.

2445. And good land?—Not so good as in Nova Scotia; it is generally covered by pine timber, and that is not an indication of the best soil.

2446. What part of those provinces should you think best suited for emigration, on a considerable scale?—There are tracts all over the province, which are all good, I think; I cannot specify any particular place; there is a large tract of country between the sources of the St. John's river on the one hand, and the sources of the Miramichi, which opens into the Bay of Fundy; there is a great tract of land quite fit for settlement.

2447. Are there any large masses of land, which have been granted to persons without any obligation to settlement?—I know there are in both provinces; and that has been a very great injury to the settlement of the provinces.

2448. Were they not in many cases granted under engagements for settlements, which have not been fulfilled?—Yes, all those lands are liable to escheat; but government have been disposed to listen to the claims of some persons owning them, under very peculiar circumstances.

2449. Have government given any intimation to the grantees, that unless they proceed to settle them, the conditions of the grant will be enforced?—Certainly.

2450. Is the surveying department on a considerable scale in those provinces?—Yes, there is a surveyor general, who, with assistants, has surveyed all over the province, for the purpose of laying out lands for the settlers; and there is a register kept of all the locations, and a map, in the surveyor general's office, of the grants.

2451. Suppose in the present year three or four hundred settlers were sent out to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, they could be located?—I have no doubt of it, if they were sent out not too late in the fall; the chopping is generally done before the snow, and the building of houses is done to most advantage in the autumn, before the snow falls.

2452. Do the people of the colony see with pleasure the arrival of new emigrants?—Yes, they are delighted with it. The greatest drawback upon those colonies is the want of a working population; wages are very high in consequence of that.

2453. Do not you think the colonies would be very much strengthened, as to their political existence, by increasing their internal population?—There is no doubt of that.

2454. In the districts you have mentioned to have been surveyed by the surveyor general, is it the practice in his department to make roads where new settlers are expected to come?—Not in every instance.

2455. Would it be very useful to the settlers, if roads were made previously to their arrival?—No doubt of it.

2456. Would that give much employment to persons in the different parts of Nova Scotia?—Yes, most undoubtedly; it is the most important step to the settlement of the country.

2457. Would it add to the value of the allotments, if the roads were made?—Very much.

2458. Do you conceive that would be a beneficial expenditure on the part of the government?—No doubt of it; but the provinces always do it; it is done out of the provincial funds; the roads are always made as a matter of course.

Capt.
Henry W. Scott,
R. N.

3 April,
1847.

2459. Can you form any opinion as to the number of men who could find employment in that province as labourers, if they were to go out?—I should say any number, with reference to the quantity of unlocated land.

2460. Do you think a thousand could find employment as mere labourers?—Yes, or a greater number.

2461. You have stated in a former part of your evidence, that it would be necessary to employ a hired labourer at the beginning of the settlement; supposing an emigration of agricultural labourers from England, or persons moderately skilled in agricultural labour, to be furnished with a year or a year and a half's provisions, do you think that though not skilled in the use of the axe, they would be able to maintain themselves after the expiration of that period?—I think that if government were to give them two years provisions, they would be able to do it after that on their own land.

2462. When you stated that settlers would be able at the end of five years to pay 3*l*. for their allotments, did you contemplate the sort of settlers who have gone there hitherto?—I speak particularly of Scotch settlers, who are the best and most industrious.

2463. Do you contemplate persons who have no capital, or persons who have a capital?—Persons who have no capital, or very little, as I have already stated.

2464. Is it your opinion that if three thousand paupers were sent out well provided, and were tolerably skilled in ordinary agricultural labour, they would be enabled at the end of five years to pay 3*l*. a year for their land?—Yes; when I say they have no capital, I suppose them to be supplied for two years with provisions, that government put them down under that supposition; I have no doubt they would be enabled, at the expiration of that period, to pay 3*l*.

2465. What would be the value of those two years provisions for a man, his wife, and three children?—Twelve or fourteen pounds a year; and they will require seeds and implements of husbandry.

2466. Do you conceive there would be greater facility in emigrants from Nova Scotia going to the United States, than from Canada?—The facilities are quite numerous enough in Nova Scotia; I have never been in Canada.

2467. Do you think that a great number of emigrants who have gone to Nova Scotia, have gone over to the United States?—The greater number have gone.

2468. When you speak of emigrants, you do not mean those who have been settled on lands in Nova Scotia?—No, I mean the emigrant who has been landed there, and felt his way afterwards to the United States soon after his landing.

2469. That observation would not apply to any class of emigrants settled on land, leaving that to go to the United States?—No, I think certainly not.